DELEGATED REPORT / CASE OFFICER'S ASSESSMENT

Ref No: ST/0136/19/HFUL
Proposal: Two Storey side extension - family room/kitchen and bedroom, with 2no. rooflights to front roof slope, 1no. to rear.
Location: 115 Marsden Road
South Shields
NE34 6RH

Site Visit Made: 11/03/2019

Relevant policies/SPDs

1 DM1 - Management of Development (A and B)

2 SPD9 - Householder Developments

Description of the site and of the proposals

This application relates to a south facing semi-detached property in the established residential area of South Shields. The property has two storeys and a pitched roof. To the front elevation there is a pitched roof dormer window and to the rear elevation there is a flat roof dormer window. The property occupies a corner plot on the corner of Marsden Road and Harton Rise. To the west of the property there is a garden area which is enclosed by a wall approximately 1m in height. A concrete driveway leads onto Harton Rise.

This application seeks full planning permission to construct a two storey side extension to the western elevation. Amended plans were submitted on 14/3/2019 and propose the following development. The extension would be 4.3m in width. It would have a pitched roof dormer window to its front elevation and a flat roof dormer window to its rear elevation. The front elevation would be set back by 1m at first floor level.

It was not considered to be necessary to re-notify neighbours about the changes, having regard to our Statement of Community Involvement because these would not materially affect their amenity relative to what they were consulted upon and since the changes have made the proposal smaller.

Publicity / Consultations (Expiry date 29/03/2019)

1) **Neighbour responses - None**

2) **Other Consultee responses - None**

Assessment

In assessing this application due regard has been had to the requirement of section 149 of the Equality Act 2010. The main considerations are the impacts the development will have on residential and visual amenity. LDF Policy DM1 seeks to preserve residential and visual amenity.

SPD9 states that in order to preserve the character of the street scene two-storey side extensions on corner plots should not extend beyond the established building line of the return side street frontage.

SPD9 also states that in situations where terracing would not arise, because there is no development immediately adjoining the location of the proposed extension, it may still be necessary to provide a set-back between the front wall of the upper storey extension and the main front wall of the house, and a lower ridge line, in order to achieve an appropriate design in the context of the street scene. In such situations an extension should always complement the scale, shape and proportions of the original dwelling, taking account of matters such as brick bonding, materials matching, roof design and the width of the proposed extension. Many of these design issues can be eliminated by use of a setback.

SPD9 continues to state that side extensions which are excessively wide can undermine the character of the street and of the existing property. To maintain a reasonable level of subordination, side extensions should not be more than 3 metres in width or be more than half of the width of the original dwelling frontage, whichever is the greater.

The extension as originally proposed was to be 5.5m in width with a flush front elevation at first floor level. The Case Officer advised the agent that such a proposal would be contrary to the guidance set out in SPD9 as above. Consequently, amended plans were submitted on 14/03/2019. It is these plans upon which the application has been determined.

The proposed side extension (as amended) would be 4.3m in width. The existing dwelling is 5.5m in width and so the proposed extension would therefore be considerably greater than half the width of the existing property (as required by SPD9). This would lead to an imbalance in the existing attractive pair of semi-detached properties, to the detriment of the visual amenity of the area. This would be exacerbated given the site's location on a corner plot.

Furthermore, the established building line of the return side street frontage (the front building line of Harton Rise) is set 1.4m to the west of the western elevation of the existing host property. The proposed extension would therefore project 2.9m beyond the established building line of the return side street frontage. The frontage of Harton Rise has a consistent building line for some distance to the north. All properties are of the same design and there is no stagger in the building line. Whilst there are some properties with bay windows and porches, these do not project a considerable distance and are only single storey. The proposal, however, would project 2.9m beyond that building line and would have two storeys; the proposed development would therefore be out of character with the character and appearance of the area, and would be detrimental to the visual amenity of the area, contrary to LDF Policy DM1 and the guidance as set out in SPD9.

In terms of residential amenity, the extension would be set 2.6m from the southern side elevation of No. 2 Harton Rise. It is not considered that the proposal would lead to a significant loss of residential amenity to that property. The proposed rear dormer window would face towards the gable elevation of No. 2. That elevation hosts two windows (which do not appear to be to habitable rooms) at first floor level. It is not considered that there would be a significant loss of privacy to No. 2. It is not considered that the proposal would lead to a significant loss of residential amenity to any other properties.

In conclusion, having regard for the above, whist it is not considered that the proposed development would lead to any significant harm to residential amenity, it is considered that the proposed development would result in a considerable level of significant harm to the character and appearance of the area. Consequently the proposed development would not comply with local and national planning policy and so the application is recommended for refusal.

Recommendation

Refuse Householder Permission

Refusal Reasons

1 The proposed two storey side extension, by virtue of its scale and massing and excessive projection, would appear incongruous and unsympathetic to the immediate area. As such the development would be detrimental to visual amenity and it would fail to accord with adopted Policy DM1 (A) of the South Tyneside Local Development Framework Development Management development plan document or the associated design guidance held within Supplementary Planning Document 9: Householder Extensions.

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. However, the proposed development is contrary to the policies referred to in the reason(s) for refusal and it has not been possible to reach an agreed solution in this case.

Case officer: Seán Gallagher
Signed:
Date: 01/04/2019

Authorised Signatory:
Date: