DELEGATED REPORT / CASE OFFICER'S ASSESSMENT

Ref No: ST/0916/18/HFUL
Proposal: Single storey rear extension.
Location: 66 Summerhill Road
South Shields
NE34 6RZ

Site Visit Made: 18/10/18

Relevant policies/SPDs

1 DM1 - Management of Development (A & B)

2 SPD9 - Householder Developments

Description of the site and of the proposals

The application site is a mid-twentieth century terraced dwelling, within a plot with a long narrow rear garden, situated within a residential area populated by similar dwellings.

The application seeks to erect a single-storey rear extension, with a 3.6 metre projection, built along the side property boundary with 64 Summerhill Road to the north. It would have a flat roof at 3.4 metres in height, extending across the full width of the property. This would replace an existing extension with a 2.5 metre projection, which extending along approximately half of the width of the property (away from the joint boundary with 64 Summerhill Road). The existing extension has a single pitched roof, with a higher maximum height than the proposed extension, but a lower eaves height.

Publicity / Consultations (Expiry date 31/10/18)

1) Neighbour responses

No responses received from neighbours.

Assessment

Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires that an application for planning permission must be determined in accordance with the adopted development plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

The main issues relevant to the assessment of this proposal are the;

- Design of the proposal and its impact on visual amenity; and
- Impact on residential amenity;

Design/Visual Amenity

Design guidance in SPD9 considers a 3 metre rear projection to ordinarily be acceptable. The proposed extension would have a longer 3.6 metre projection in this instance, extending across the full width of the property, with a flat roof at 3.4 metres in height. The proposed extension is considered to result in a suitably proportionate and subservient addition to the main property in this instance. The external

materials, which include a matching brick on the side boundary elevation that faces the neighbour to the north, and white render to the other elevations and on the rear elevation, which, although different to the existing is considered to be acceptable. The roof, window and door detailing is also considered to be acceptable.

It is considered that the development would not be harmful to the property's overall character or the character of the surrounding area. As the extension would be located to the rear of the property, it would not be publicly visible within the street scene.

The proposal would convey sensitive consideration of its surroundings and would accord with LDF Policy DM1 (A), while having sufficient regard to the design principles set out in SPD 9.

Residential Amenity

The proposed rear extension is situated along the boundary with 64 Summerhill Road. The proposal would bring a brick wall in much closer proximity to number 64 than the existing rear extension, which is situated several metres away, and with a shorter projection. However, it is not considered that an extension with a 3.6 metre projection built up to the side boundary would unacceptably impact on the residential amenities of occupiers in this instance.

It is considered that the proposal would not significantly impact upon the outlook from the conservatory that is situated at the rear of 64 Summerhill Road and close to the joint boundary between 64 and 66 Summerhill Road. This is because a good outlook would be maintained to out of the rear and opposite side, while the outlook facing south, towards the application site, would not be significantly impacted upon as this side of the conservatory currently faces onto a high boundary fence between the two properties.

Some potential for overshadowing of the rear garden of 64 Summerhill Road is likely to arise when the sun is in the south-east, due to the location of the extension however, the likely impact of any additional overshadowing arising from the extension is not considered to be significant, above and beyond existing shadowing that can be caused by the presence of the existing dwellings to the east and south-east of the garden, and the existing rear extension.

The proposed extension is likely to cause some additional overshadowing of the conservatory at number 64, but it is not considered that the degree of overshadowing would cause any significant harm to the amenity of occupiers. Sunlight to the rear garden areas from the south and west and to the conservatory from the south west/west would not be impacted upon by the development.

It is not considered that the proposed development would materially impact on the residential amenities of the occupiers of 68 Summerhill, as this property would be located to the south of the proposed extension, and as the proposed extension would be located in the same location as the existing rear extension, approximately 3.5 metres from the property boundary, with an additional rear projection of just over a metre. It is not considered that there would be any potential for significant impacts in terms of overshadowing or outlook from this property.

The side elevations to both sides would not contain windows, meaning that the proposed development would not create any overlooking or privacy concerns. However, side facing ground floor windows could be added using permitted development rights under Part 1 Class A of the GPDO. In this instance, such windows could have a harmful impact in terms of overlooking/privacy as the side elevation of the extension would be situated directly onto the boundary with 64 Summerhill Road. It is therefore considered that a planning condition is included as part of any approval issued to prevent the installation of side facing windows in this north facing side elevation at ground floor level without planning permission first being obtained, to prevent a potential harmful impact on the amenity of neighbours from being created. This is not considered necessary facing 68 Summerhill Road, due to the distance the

extension would be located from the boundary, combined with the existing high boundary treatment along the side, which would be unaffected by the proposals.

The development is considered to be in accordance with Policy DM1 (B), while having sufficient regard to the design principles set out in SPD 9.

Summary

It is considered that, in the site circumstances and context of this particular case, that the proposal would be in accordance with Local Development Framework (LDF) Policy DM1 (A & B), having regard to design guidance in Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) 9 'Householder Developments', and to all other material planning considerations. It is considered that the proposal would be an acceptable form of development, subject to the inclusion of the suggested conditions.

In assessing this application due regard has been had to the requirement of section 149 of the Equality Act 2010.

Recommendation

Grant Permission Householder with Conditions

Conditions

1 The development to which this permission relates must be commenced not later than 3 years from the date of this permission.

As required by Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and to ensure that the development is carried out within a reasonable time.

2 The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plan(s) as detailed below

Drg No. 2958 received 27/09/2018

Any minor material changes to the approved plans will require a formal planning application under S73 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 to vary this condition and substitute alternative plans.

In order to provide a procedure to seek approval of proposed minor material change which is not substantially different from that which has been approved.

3 The brickwork used in external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall be of similar appearance to the brickwork used in the construction of the exterior of the existing building on which the extension will form part. Other external materials shall be as stated on the planning application form received 27/09/18 and Drg No. 2958 received 27/09/2018. Unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority pursuant to this condition.

To ensure a satisfactory standard of development and in the interests of visual amenity in accordance with South Tyneside LDF Development Management Policy DM1.

4 Notwithstanding the provisions of the Article 3 and Class A of Part 1 of Schedule 2 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (or any order revoking and re-enacting that order with or without modification), no windows or openings other than those shown on the approved plans shall be inserted in the north facing side elevation (towards 64 Summerhill Road) of the extension hereby approved, without an application for planning permission having first been made to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.

To ensure the protection of privacy for neighbouring occupiers, and in the interests of residential amenity, in accordance with South Tyneside LDF Development Management Policy DM1.

Informatives

1 In dealing with this application the Council has implemented the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework to seek to approve applications for sustainable development where possible.

2 The proposed development lies within a coal mining area which may contain unrecorded coal mining related hazards. If any coal mining feature is encountered during development, this should be reported immediately to the Coal Authority on 0345 762 6848.

Further information is also available on the Coal Authority website at: www.gov.uk/government/organisations/the-coal-authority

Case officer: Chris Stanworth
Signed:
Date: 01/11/18

Authorised Signatory:
Date:

«END»