DELEGATED REPORT / CASE OFFICER'S ASSESSMENT

Ref No: ST/0511/19/HFUL
Proposal: Single storey side extension; pitched roof (creating two additional bedrooms)
Location: 11 Oswald Close
Boldon Colliery
NE35 9BY

Site Visit Made: 04/07/19

Relevant policies/SPDs

1 DM1 - Management of Development (A, B, C)

2 SPD9 - Householder Developments

Description of the site and of the proposals

Planning permission is sought for the proposed construction of a single storey side extension at 11 Oswald Close, Boldon Colliery. The property is a modern buff brick built two-storey dwelling, with a red brick base and red concrete roof tiles. It is a relatively wide dwelling (approx. 9 metres wide), with a symmetrical appearance, with a two storey dual pitched roof projection to the front containing the main front door, with windows serving habitable rooms to either side. A detached garage (dual pitched roof) of similar materials is located at the opposite side to where the proposed extension would be located.

The property is situated on a corner plot within a modern residential estate, with the property having an unusually wide area of land to the side where the extension is proposed, in comparison with other properties on the street, which includes four cherry blossom trees and a car parking area located beyond this.

The proposed side extension would be marginally below 6 metres in width and would accommodate two bedrooms. The application proposes a single storey extension with matching facing brick and concrete tiles, with a dual pitched roof.

The application proposals have been revised with amended plans received on 13/08/19. The originally submitted plans had proposed an extension with the same width, providing the same amount of single storey accommodation, but with a single pitched roof. This would have been significantly higher in terms of its maximum height, adjoining the existing dwelling at the top of the upper floor, at the eaves height of the main roof.

Publicity / Consultations (Expiry date 23/07/19)

1) Neighbour responses

None received.

The revisions to the proposals that have been do are not considered to have any additional potential to impact on the amenity of neighbours compared with the original proposals. No neighbours had commented on the original proposals. It is considered that no further neighbour notification is required on the amended plans, in accordance with South Tyneside Council's Statement of Community Involvement.

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 for consideration in the determination of this planning application are:

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

Design & Visual Amenity

South Tyneside Local Development Framework DM1 (A) requires that extensions and alterations to existing buildings are designed to convey sensitive consideration of their surroundings;

Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) 9 'Householder Developments' provides detailed advice on the design of residential extensions and accords with the objectives of LDF Policy DM1, which was adopted in December 2011. Both of these documents are in line with the objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework. Of particular relevance are the following paragraphs.

Supplementary Planning Document 9: Paragraph 3.11 – An extension should complement the shape, scale and proportions of the original dwelling to maintain the character of the original dwelling;

Paragraph 3.12 – Extensions should ideally reflect the design and symmetry of the existing property. The choice of detailing should match those on the original house wherever possible;

Paragraph 3.14 – a key objective in the case of side extensions is to achieve subordination (the use of setbacks and a lowered ridgeline are suggested). The width of a side extension should also be subordinate and in scale to the width of the original dwelling.

Paragraph 6.3 – Single storey extensions should not normally have a width greater than half the width of the existing property;

Officers relayed concerns to the applicant's agent regarding the proposal originally submitted. The original proposal had both a substantial width and significant height, adjoining the property at the eaves height of the existing two-storey dwelling. The single pitched roof also was not considered to correspond well with the character and appearance of the existing property and this effect was magnified by the scale, massing, height and width of the proposed extension. It was considered that those factors would have given the extension a dominant appearance that lacked subservience to the main dwelling and unbalanced the appearance of the existing property.

The proposals have subsequently been revised on 13/08/19, altering the roof form to provide a dual pitched roof corresponding better with the roof of main property and reducing the height of the extension to increase its subservience in relation to the existing property. While the proposal would still have a significant width (approximately 6 metres rather than the half-width of 4.5 metres suggested in SPD9) it is considered that this would now be acceptable on balance. The extension put forward within the revised proposal would be less dominant, with increased subservience. The alteration to the roof form and reduction in height and overall massing of this extension would mean that the significant width of the extension would not have such a harmful unbalancing effect on the host property as the original proposal. The corner plot location and the significant gap between the side elevation of the existing property and other built development also help to limit the visual impacts of the proposed extension, which is considered to be acceptable in the context of the immediate street scene.

The proposals would involve the loss of two of four young cherry blossom trees within the site, with two to be retained. The trees are not protected by a Tree Preservation Order, and, while it would be desirable to retain these trees, it is not considered that the loss of these two trees would have such a significant impact on the visual amenity of the area to warrant refusal of the application due to the removal of these trees.

The revised proposal submitted on 13/08/19 sufficiently conveys sensitive consideration of its surroundings and, on balance would accord with LDF Policy DM1 (A & C). The external materials proposed would be suitable in relation to the existing dwelling. A planning condition is suggested to control the external materials.

Residential Amenity

The proposed side extension would not be located in close proximity to habitable room openings of other dwellings and it is therefore considered that the proposal would not materially affect the amenities of the occupiers of neighbouring properties by way of loss of privacy or outlook, or by way of any unacceptable overshadowing or overbearing impacts in relation to space within neighboring properties or their gardens areas.

It is considered that the proposal would be acceptable in relation to the impact on the residential amenities of the occupiers of the neighbouring properties, in accordance with South Tyneside LDF Policy DM1 (B) and the associated SPD9 in this respect.

Summary

It is considered that, in the site circumstances and context of this particular case, that this proposal would be in accordance with Local Development Framework (LDF) policies DM1 (A, B & C), having regard to all other material planning considerations, including the design guidance in SPD9. 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

ST/PL/0089/001 Rev A received 13/08/19

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: Chris Stanworth
Signed:
Date: 15/08/19

Authorised Signatory:
Date:

«END»