DELEGATED REPORT / CASE OFFICER'S ASSESSMENT

Ref No: ST/0257/19/HFUL
Proposal: Alteration and extension to existing property to create ground floor living accommodation for applicant along with works to create a 2nd floor living space in the attic. Works include demolition of existing garage and various outbuildings.
Location: 137 King George Road
South Shields
NE34 0EU

Site Visit Made: 17/04/2019

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 west facing, detached dwellinghouse in the established residential area of South Shields. The property has two storeys and to the rear there is a two storey hipped roof projection. The property has a modest garden to the rear which contains two low timber pigeon lofts to the north. There is a small brick lean to to the rear of the two storey offshoot. To the southern side of the property there is a driveway which leads to a detached garage within the rear garden which has a lean to shed to its northern elevation.

This application seeks full planning permission to construct a single storey extension to the southern side of the property which would wrap around the rear elevation of the two storey offshoot to the rear of the property. The extension would have a hipped roof which would have a 'cut out' lowered section around the existing large window in the southern elevation. The roof of the extension would host six roof lights. A new obscurely glazed window would be inserted to the southern elevation at second floor level. Two new windows would be inserted into the front elevation at second floor level within the front gable elevation. Two new windows would be inserted into the rear elevation at second floor level within the rear gable elevation. A new roof light would be inserted into the front roof slope of the existing property. The existing garage, lean to shed to the garage, brick lean to to the rear of the offshoot and the pigeon lofts would be removed. The existing chimney would be removed.

Publicity / Consultations (Expiry date 02/05/2019)

1) Neighbour responses

93 West Avenue, South Shields

1no. letter of objection received raising the following issues:
- Loss of sunlight to the rear of No. 93 West Avenue and its garden.
- The property is currently 7m from the boundary with No. 93 West Avenue. The extension would be 1.5m from the boundary. There would be an increase in noise, cooking smells etc. at the property which would impact upon the living conditions and privacy of No. 93.
- The two windows to the rear elevation at second floor level will result in loss of privacy and overlooking to No. 93 West Avenue.

96 West Avenue

1no. letter of objection received raising the following issues:
- The proposed extension is disproportionate to the size of the main building and the site.
- The proposed extension will be set 1m from the boundary with No. 96 West Avenue and so the smells and fumes from the kitchen will be invasive.
- The upper rear windows proposed in the eaves space will face immediately into our property and should at least be obscure glass.
- The property is a characterful 1920s/30s residence and is currently sympathetically modernised. The proposed plans do not appear to reflect this and I feel would alter the charm and street view of the area.
- It is not clear if the proposed plans make this a "house of multiple occupation". However, by the number of bedrooms planned this would appear to be the case, and as such I object to the increase [*in*] noise that this will undoubtedly bring to a quiet residential area.

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. Policy DM1 seeks to protect residential and visual amenity.

Impact on Residential Amenity

The proposed extension would be set 0.3m from the boundary with the property to the south, No. 139 King George Road. Given the orientation of the two properties there would be no overshadowing to No. 139 as a result of the proposal. No. 139 itself is set approximately 4m from the boundary. The host property has a garage upon the boundary to the rear as existing. Given this distance and also the presence of the existing garage, it is not considered that the proposed extension would lead to any significant further loss of outlook to No. 139. There would be no windows in the southern side elevation of the extension and so there would be no loss of privacy to No. 139.

The proposal would be set 8m from the site's northern boundary with No. 135 King George Road and so it is not considered that there would be any reduction in residential amenity to that property as a result of the proposal.

The extension would be set between 2m and 1.5m from the rear boundary of the garden (due to a tapering boundary). At this point, the rear boundary is shared with No. 91 West Road. As existing, there is a lean to shed and garage upon the boundary at this point. The boundary is formed of a timber fence approximately 2m in height. No. 91 is set approximately 12m from the boundary. Given this distance, it is considered that there would be no significant adverse impact upon the residential amenity of No. 91 in terms of loss of outlook, or overshadowing. There would be two windows in the rear elevation of the proposal which would face the boundary with No. 91. These windows would serve a kitchen and a dining room. SPD9 notes that a solid boundary treatment may be a suitable alternative to obscure glazing where the boundary treatment comprises of a 1.8m high solid boundary treatment. Given the opaque nature of the boundary treatment, it is not considered that there would be a significant loss of privacy to No. 91.

The rear boundary is also shared with No. 93 West Road. That property is set approximately 12m from the boundary. Given that distance and the orientation of the two properties, it is not considered that the

proposal would lead to a significant reduction in residential amenity to that property, particularly in terms of overshadowing or loss of outlook. The nearest windows in the development to the boundary with No. 93 are those in the rear elevation of the rear extension. The window in the northern side elevation of the rear extension would be set 4.2m from this boundary. However, given the oblique angle from these windows towards the boundary with No. 93, and also the opaque nature of the boundary treatment, there would not be a significant loss of privacy to No. 93.

An objection has been received from No. 96 West Avenue regarding the impact that the development would have upon that property by way of loss of privacy, and also from cooking smells and fumes. No. 96 West Road is set on the eastern side of West Road, over 40m from the site, and the site is obscured from No. 96 by No. 91 and No. 93 West Road. Consequently, it is not considered that there would be a significant loss of privacy, or any other impact upon the residential amenity of No. 96 as a result of the proposal.

It is proposed to insert two windows at second floor level in the front gable of the property. This would be acceptable and would not lead to any significant adverse impact upon the residential amenity of any neighbouring properties.

It is also proposed to insert two windows at second floor level in the rear gable of the property. This would be acceptable and would not lead to any significant adverse impact upon the residential amenity of any neighbouring properties. The windows would be set 10.5m from the rear boundary of the site, and approximately 22m from the rear elevations of Nos. 91 and 93 West Road to the rear, and at least 40m from No. 96 West Road (although that property would be obscured by No. 91 and No. 93). SPD9 notes that proposed habitable room windows and those on the main rear elevation of facing dwellings should be sufficient to ensure a reasonable level of privacy for the residents opposite. Given the distance between the proposed windows and the neighbouring properties to the rear, it is not considered that the windows would result in such a significant loss of privacy to warrant refusal.

The proposed development would not change the use of the property; it would still be used as a dwellinghouse. Furthermore, the current proposal is not to use the property as a House in Multiple Occupation. Therefore it is not considered that the proposal would lead to any significant further increase in odours or noise being omitted from the property, above those levels which would normally be anticipated from a dwellinghouse. This would therefore not have a significant adverse impact upon the residential amenity of any neighbouring property.

Impact on Visual Amenity

In terms of design, SPD9 states that single storey side extensions should not normally have a width greater than half the width of the existing property. SPD9 also states that single storey rear extensions of 4m projection are acceptable to detached properties.

The extension would project 3.7m beyond the southern side elevation of the host property and 5.3m beyond the rear elevation of the two storey rear offshoot. The host property is 9m in width and so the side extension would be considerably less than half the width of the existing property. The extension would be in excess of the projection for rear extensions as set out in SPD9. However, the property has a large garden and given the presence of the existing garage, and also given that there would be no significant adverse impact upon the residential amenity of neighbouring properties, this would be acceptable on balance.

The property is a 1920s/30s detached dwelling with an interesting hipped roof design. It is not a listed building, nor is on South Tyneside's Local List. The surrounding properties display many similar characteristics, however many have been extended in a variety of ways, including extensions similar to that proposed by this application. The hipped roof design of the proposal would be in keeping with the design of the host property and surrounding properties. This would be acceptable and it is considered that there would be no significant harm to the character and appearance of the area.

Other Matters

Whilst the garage car parking space and part of the driveway would be lost, space for car parking would remain on the driveway to the front of the property; therefore there would be adequate car parking at the site.

In conclusion, the proposal would comply with all relevant local and national planning policy. The proposal is considered to be acceptable and the application is recommended for approval.

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. 180043-01 received 01/04/2019
Drg No. 180043-03 received 01/04/2019
Drg No. 180043-04 received 01/04/2019
Drg No. 180043-05 received 01/04/2019
Drg No. 180043-06 received 01/04/2019

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 external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall be of similar appearance to those used in the construction of the exterior of the existing building on which the extension will form part. 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.

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: Seán Gallagher
Signed:
Date: 17/05/2019

Authorised Signatory:
Date:

«END»