DELEGATED REPORT / CASE OFFICER'S ASSESSMENT

Ref No: ST/0502/19/HFUL
Proposal: Internal remodelling and extension of existing bungalow (new extension will provide new bedroom, stairway and garage to ground floor with a bedroom, landing and bathroom to first floor)
Location: 16 Prince of Wales Close
South Shields
NE34 6QT

Site Visit Made: 10/07/2019

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 single storey bungalow in the established residential area of South Shields. The property has a pitched roof and to its western elevation there is a flat roof single storey kitchen extension. There is also a single storey flat roof attached garage to the western elevation which is attached to a flat roof porch and front projection.

This application seeks full planning permission to construct a two storey side extension to the western elevation. The existing garage and kitchen would be demolished. The existing front porch and projection would be retained. Although two storey, the roof of the proposed extension would be set marginally lower (0.05m) than the roof of the host property to the front and would be pitched to the front and flat to the rear. The ground floor level of the proposed side extension would be set 0.3m lower than the ground floor level of the existing property and internally steps would lead up to the present ground floor ; this would be achieved by lowering the ground level of the parcel of land on which the side extension would be situated by 0.3m.

Amended plans were received on 30th July 2019. Neighbouring properties were re-notified of the amended plans on 1st August 2019 and were given 14 days in which to make further representations in line with the Council's Statement of Community Involvement.

Publicity / Consultations (Expiry date 15/08/2019)

1) Neighbour responses

4no. representations have been received in total in objection to the application from the following properties: 2 Lascelles Avenue, 183 King George Road, 185 King George Road (two representations). The following issues were raised:

- **Loss of privacy** - particularly from the windows to the side elevation of the proposal, and the upper floor windows to the rear elevation of the proposal.

- **Design** - comments that the proposal looks like a commercial building, is not aesthetically in keeping with surrounding properties and that the rear of the property should be of equal importance as the front.

- **Loss of property value**.

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 amenity and visual amenity, which LDF Policy DM1 seeks to preserve.

Impact on Residential Amenity

SPD9 seeks to ensure that that there is no unacceptable impact on the amenity of neighbours in relation to Privacy, Outlook and Over Dominance, and Overshadowing.

The proposal would be set 1.5m from the site's western boundary with Nos. 185 and 187 King George Road but 19.5m from the rear elevations of those properties themselves. Given this distance there would be no significant overshadowing, loss of outlook, or over dominance to those properties.

The proposal would be 6m from the site's rear boundary with No. 2 Lascelles Avenue and 20m from the rear elevation of that property itself. Given this distance there would be no significant overshadowing, loss of outlook, or over dominance to that property.

The proposal would be set 7.8m from the adjoining property to the east, No. 15 Prince of Wales Close. It would be largely obscured from that property by the main bulk of the host property but nevertheless, given the distance between the proposal and the boundary with No. 15, there would be no significant overshadowing, loss of outlook, or over dominance to that property.

With regard to privacy, SPD9 notes that "windows of extensions should be positioned so that they do not directly look into the habitable room windows of neighbouring properties" and also states that "It would normally be expected that a proposed two storey or upper floor extension would not face the front or rear elevation of an adjacent property at a distance of less than 14 metres". SPD9 further states that "the extent to which an extension impacts on a neighbour's outdoor space is a material consideration but is given less weight than impacts from within the dwelling."

There would be the following windows present in the western elevation of the proposal: 1no. high level window to ground floor serving a bedroom; 1no. high level window to first floor also serving a bedroom; 1no. window at ground floor level to the hallway adjacent to the front door, and; 1no. full height window to stairs and landing at first floor level.

Whilst the proposal would be set 1.5m from the site's western boundary, the distance from the proposal's western elevation to the rear elevations of the properties on King George Road is approximately 19.5m. Consequently given this distance, and having regard to the guidance as set out in SPD9, it is not considered that the proposal would lead to such a significant loss of privacy to those neighbouring properties to warrant refusal.

The rear elevation of the extension would contain: 1no. set of patio doors and 3no. windows at ground floor level, and; 1no. window at first floor level.

The rear elevation of the proposal would be a minimum of 6m from the site's rear boundary and would be approximately 20m from the rear elevations of properties on Lascelles Avenue. Consequently it is not considered that the proposal would lead to such a significant loss of privacy to those neighbouring properties to warrant refusal, having regard to that distance from the rear elevations of properties on Lascelles Avenue and also the guidance as set out in SPD9.

There would be no windows facing towards the boundary with No. 15 Prince of Wales Close and so there would be no significant loss of privacy to that property.

A resident has raised a concern that the proposal would result in the loss of value of their property. This is not a material planning consideration and so cannot be taken into account when determining the application.

Impact on Visual Amenity

In terms of two storey side extensions, SPD9 states that proposals must have regard to the general principles set out in Section 3 of SPD9 and set out as follows:

In assessing planning applications for all extensions and alterations to dwellings it is important that the following objectives are met:

A) that the visual impact of the proposal on the dwelling and its immediate neighbourhood is acceptable and that high standards of urban design are achieved;

B) that there is no unacceptable impact on the amenity of neighbours in relation to:
   i) Privacy
   ii) Outlook and Over Dominance
   iii) Overshadowing;

C) that there is no unacceptable impact on highway safety and off-road vehicle parking; and

D) the impact on any trees and their root systems within or adjacent to the property is given appropriate consideration.

SPD9 further states that to achieve the desired subordinate appearance and to minimise any terracing effect, two-storey side extensions on semi-detached and high-density detached properties should:

- retain a minimum 1 metre gap between the extension and the side boundary of the application site;

- provide a minimum 1 metre set-back between the front wall of the upper storey extension and the main front wall of the house;

- provide a significantly lowered ridge line and a roof shape that corresponds to the main dwelling.

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.

The council recognises that the above guidance may not be suitable in all situations and that the design and suitability of an extension is dependent upon the site-specific circumstances, the need to protect residential and visual amenity and to achieve a design that respects the scale, character and appearance of the dwelling and its neighbourhood, having regard to the general principles set out in Section 3. In some cases the above guidance may be relaxed if two or more of the following criteria exist:

- there is a marked stagger in the building line between the dwelling and the affected neighbour;

- the dwelling to be extended is of a substantially different type, scale and massing to the adjacent dwelling;

- the adjacent property is incapable of being extended in the same direction; and

- there is a significant difference in ground levels between the dwellings to be extended and the affected neighbour.

The proposed side extension would be set to the western elevation of the property. It would be 4m in width at the front, tapering to 2.9m to the rear. The host property is 8.1m in width and so the proposal would comply with the guidance as set out in SPD9 in terms of the width of the extension.

The proposal would retain a minimum 1 metre gap between the extension and the side boundary of the application site and would provide a minimum 1 metre set-back between the front wall of the upper storey extension and the main front wall of the house. However, it would not provide a significantly lowered ridge line despite partially displaying a roof shape that corresponds to the main dwelling

Nevertheless, the properties to the western side of the host property are set approximately 19.5m distant, and so would be highly unlikely to be extended up to the boundary. Furthermore, those properties are of a substantially different type to the host property. The guidance as set out in SPD9 notes that the above guidance should be relaxed should these circumstances arise. As a result, the fact that the ridge of the roof is not significantly lower than the ridge of the host property's existing roof is acceptable, especially given that the front elevation of the proposal is set back by 1m, as required by SPD9.

The application site is set at the end of a cul-de-sac, Prince Edward Close. The end of the cul-de-sac can only be viewed from within the cul-de-sac itself and not from the wider public area. The properties located on Prince Edward Close are of a variety of designs. Many display flat roofs and pitched roofs simultaneously. Many properties have also been extended with a variety of pitched and flat roof extensions. There is no defining characteristic of the street scene and as a result it is not considered that the combination of pitched and flat roofs in the proposed extension would represent an incongruous feature within the vicinity. Furthermore the property and the attached semi detached dwelling also display flat roof projections as existing.

Whilst a two storey side extension to an existing single storey bungalow is a somewhat unusual proposal, from the front the proposed extension would appear marginally lower than the host property, with the pitched roof being set back by 1m from the main pitched roof of the host property. Therefore the proposal would not appear out of keeping with the area, especially having regard to the eclectic design of surrounding properties.

In order to achieve a ridge line which is set marginally lower than the existing host property, the ground floor level of the proposed side extension would be 0.3m lower than the ground floor level of the existing

host property. This would require the land on which the extension would be set to be lowered by 0.3m. This would be acceptable.

To the rear, the flat roof would project higher than the existing pitched roof line of the host property. However this design feature would not be highly visible within the context of the street scene, being located to the rear of the property. It is considered that the resultant level of harm would not be greater than that which would be experienced as a result of a flat roof rear box dormer, which could be constructed under permitted development rights. Consequently it is not considered that the rear portion of the extension would result in such significant harm to the character and appearance of the area to warrant refusal.

The extension would be partially clad with upvc to match the existing property but for the most part would be constructed of brick. This would be acceptable.

In conclusion, it is not considered that the proposal would lead to such significant harm to the character and appearance of the area to warrant refusal.

Summary

The proposal extension would not result in any significant harm to the residential amenity of neighbouring properties or any significant harm to the visual amenity of the area. The proposal would therefore comply with all relevant local and national planning policy and the application is therefore 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

Dwg No. AL(0)004 Rev F received 30/07/2019
Dwg No. AL(0)005 Rev D received 30/07/2019
Dwg No. AL(0)006 Rev C received 30/07/2019
Dwg No. AL(0)007 Rev A received 30/07/2019

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 as set out on the plans as listed in condition 2 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: 21/08/2019

Authorised Signatory:
Date:

«END»