DELEGATED REPORT / CASE OFFICER'S ASSESSMENT

Ref No: ST/0531/19/HFUL
Proposal: Erection of two-storey and single storey extension to the south side of existing dwelling.
Location: 1 Sunniside Leigh
Cleadon
Sunderland
SR6 7XH

Site Visit Made: 28/08/2019

Relevant policies/SPDs

1 DM1 (A and B) - Management of Development

2 SPD9 - Householder Developments

Description of the site and of the proposals

The application site is a relatively large two storey detached house, located at the junction of Sunniside Leigh and Sunniside Lane in Cleadon. It forms part of a recent housing development that was granted planning permission on 23/08/2013 (Application Ref: ST/0046/13/FUL) for the redevelopment of the former Oakleigh Gardens School.

The proposed development includes a two storey extension and a single storey extension to the south side of the existing house to provide a ground floor kitchen and living room and a first floor bedroom. The proposed materials comprise red facing brick, red tiles, grey aluminium glazing and grey UPVC facias.

The existing dwelling house faces east towards the vehicular access into the Sunniside Leigh residential estate. The proposed two storey extension would face south east towards Sunniside Lane (with the front elevation wall being 3.164 metres from the footway on Sunniside Lane). The proposed single story extension would face south towards Sunniside Lane (with the front elevation wall being between approximately 4.00 and 8.88 metres from the footway on Sunniside Lane/Sunniside Terrace). The proposed single storey extension would side on to the adjacent property, No. 1 Sunniside Terrace, which is a detached bungalow. The applicant's agent has confirmed in writing that there would be a side space of 1.322 metres between the side elevation wall of the extension and the common boundary with No. 1 Sunniside Terrace.

No. 32a Sunniside Lane, a recently constructed detached house, is located on the opposite side of Sunniside Lane. The proposed two storey extension and single storey extension would face towards the front elevation of No. 32a Sunniside Lane.

The application site is at a higher level than No. 1 Sunniside Terrace.

The planning application as originally submitted also included the provision of a first floor balcony with a glass balustrade to the rear of the proposed two storey extension, accessed from the proposed bedroom via a glazed door, and with a large full height window. However, this element of the proposal was considered to be unacceptable due to its impact on the residential amenities of the occupants of No. 1 Sunniside Terrace. The application has therefore been amended to remove those elements of the proposal.

It is this amended proposal which is being assessed.
It is noted that the proposal also includes the provision of a small first floor window within the rear elevation of the original dwelling to serve the proposed en-suite bathroom. Although this is not included

within the planning application description this small window could be installed as permitted development and therefore does not require planning permission.

Publicity / Consultations (Expiry date: 26/11/2019)

1) **Neighbour responses**

Original Proposals

One letter of objection was been received from the occupants of No. 1 Sunniside Terrace (a detached bungalow located to the west of the application site). They objected to the proposed development for the following reasons:

- Balcony reduces our privacy as it overlooks our garden, note that the original builders 'Gentoo' bricked up the upstairs back windows for this reason.
- Extension is too close to boundary/fence - less than a metre.
- Extension encloses all sides of outdoor space except to boundary. Frequently held outdoor parties will increase the noise levels as it has nowhere to dissipate to?
- Light particularly winter sunshine will be curtailed.

Amended Proposals (including removal of balcony)

No neighbour representations have been received with regard to the amended proposals.

2) **Other Consultee responses**

Environmental Health Team – Noise

I would advise that the comment from the occupant of 1 Sunniside Terrace relating to noise levels would not be a reason for Environmental Health to object to this application with regards to residential amenity of neighbouring properties. If complaints are received by Environmental Health regarding noisy parties they would be investigated accordingly.

Assessment

Relevant Planning History

ST/0046/13/FUL (Former Oakleigh Gardens School Site)
Planning permission was granted on 23/08/2013 for “Demolition of former school buildings for proposed residential development comprising the construction of 16no. detached dwellings with associated landscaping and highway works” on the site of the former Oakleigh Gardens School.

ST/0207/14/VC (Former Oakleigh Gardens School Site)
Planning permission was granted on 26/06/2014 under S73 for amendments to application Ref: ST/0046/13/FUL for revisions to the hammerhead, substitution of house types, amendments to boundary treatments and the design of dwellings.

ST/0015/16/HFUL (1 Sunniside Terrace)
Planning permission was granted on 18/02/2016 for the demolition of an existing detached garage, a single storey rear kitchen/diner extension and a new garage extension to the side of the existing dwelling. This approved rear extension included a secondary kitchen window within the side elevation facing towards No. 1 Sunniside Leigh approximately 1.4 metres from the common boundary.
Assessment of Proposals

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 the:

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

Design of the proposal and its impact on the visual amenities of the area

Paragraph 124 of the NPPF states that the creation of high quality buildings and places is fundamental to planning and good design creates better places in which to live. Paragraph 127 states that planning decisions should ensure that developments add to the overall quality of the area, are visually attractive and are sympathetic to local character.

Local Development Framework Policy DM1 (A) requires all development to be designed to convey a sensitive consideration of its surroundings, and where possible enhance its local setting and reinforce local identity, having particular regard to scale and proportions, alignment, form, use of materials and architectural detailing.

Supplementary Planning Document 9: Householder Developments provides guidance on house extensions. In terms of encouraging good design Section 3 'General Design Guidance and Objectives' notes that it is important 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'. Paragraph 3.11 states that an extension should complement the shape, scale and proportions of the original dwelling to maintain the character of the original dwelling and paragraph 3.12 states that extensions should reflect the design and symmetry of the existing property. Paragraph 3.13 states that poorly designed extensions can be detrimental to the original property and the street scene, and adds that the creation of "terracing" within a street, a lack of subordination to the host property and detrimental impacts upon any building line can result in a poor design.

Paragraph 6.3 states single storey extensions should not normally have a width greater than half the width of the existing property. However, proposals beyond this will be assessed on their own merits and in accordance with the design principles within the SPD. Paragraph 7.1 states that two-storey side extensions can create a terracing effect within the street scene and give rise to inappropriate design. Paragraph 7.3 states consideration must be given to the width of the proposed side-extension in relation to the existing property. 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. Paragraph 6.4 and 7.6 states that to preserve the character of the street scene single storey and two-storey side extensions on corner plots should not extend beyond the established building line of the return side street frontage. If no clear building line is easily identifiable along the side street, such extensions should seek to retain a minimum side space of 2 metres from the plot boundary.

The main issues to consider are whether the scale, design and materials of the proposed extensions are appropriate, having regard to the size and character of the original property, and considering its relationship with the surrounding street scene.

The existing two storey detached house has a width of approximately 9.9 metres. The proposed two storey extension would have a width of approximately 7.3 metres (at the front elevation) and the proposed single storey extension would have a width of approximately 8 metres. These two extensions together would have a width of approximately 15.3 metres, which is considerably greater than the width of the existing dwelling house. However, given that the proposed extensions are not in alignment with the original dwelling house (they effectively wrap around the corner), they are significantly lower in height

than the original dwelling house and they are “stepped down” towards No. 1 Sunniside Terrace, it is considered that, on balance, the proposed extensions would be subordinate to the original dwelling.

It is considered that the resultant side space of 1.322 metres between the side elevation wall of the proposed extension and the common boundary with No. 1 Sunniside Terrace (which would provide an overall side space of 2.916 metres between the side elevation walls of both properties) would provide an acceptable separation distance between the two properties. Given this side space and the design and location of the proposed extensions, it is considered that the proposed extensions would not create a terracing effect within the street scene.

The street layout of Sunniside Lane and Sunniside Terrace does not provide a defined building line. Whilst it would have been preferable to have retained a greater distance than 3.164 metres between the front elevation wall of the proposed two storey extension and the footway on Sunniside Lane (given that the character of the area includes relatively long front gardens and green verges), this is considered to be acceptable on balance.

Although it is considered that the contemporary design of the proposed extensions, including the large glazed windows, is not in keeping with the traditional design and detailing of the original dwelling house, the applicant’s agent has advised that “the extension is a site specific design to a unique corner plot.” In addition, No 32A Sunniside Lane (which is located opposite the proposed extensions) is a new detached dwelling with a modern design, and the design of the proposed extensions would not be dissimilar to this.

The proposed materials, which include red roof tiles, red facing brick, grey aluminium glazing and grey UPVC fascias, are considered to be acceptable. However, a planning condition is suggested to ensure that the roof tiles and facing bricks match the existing external house materials as closely as possible and that the development is constructed in accordance with the submitted details.

On balance, it is therefore considered that the proposed extensions would not have an unacceptable impact on the visual amenities of the area, including the street scene of Sunniside Lane. As such, it is considered that the proposed extensions would be in accordance with the NPPF, Policy DM1(A) of the South Tyneside Local Development Framework and the associated guidance contained within SPD9.

Impact on Residential Amenity

Policy DM1 (B) states that development must be acceptable in relation to any impact on residential amenity.

Supplementary Planning Document 9: Householder Developments provides guidance on house extensions. In terms of residential amenity paragraph 3.1 states that there should be no unacceptable impact on the amenity of neighbours in relation to privacy, outlook and over dominance and overshadowing.

With regard to outlook and over dominance, paragraph 3.22 states that a reasonable outlook should be maintained from the habitable room windows of neighbouring properties. This generally means that an extension should not be so large and/or so close that it forms a very dominant feature when looking out from habitable rooms of a neighbouring property. Paragraph 3.23 adds 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.

With regard to overshadowing, paragraph 3.24 states that any proposed extension should not result in the significant overshadowing of habitable windows of neighbouring properties over and above that of the existing situation.

The occupant of No. 1 Sunniside Terrace objected to the original proposals as they considered the proposed balcony would reduce their privacy as it would overlook their garden, the proposed extension would be too close to their boundary, the extensions would enclose all sides of the application site’s

outdoor space which would result in an increase in noise levels, and it would impact on their light, particularly winter sunshine.

The original proposals included a balcony, glass balustrade and a large window that would have faced towards the rear garden of No. 1 Sunniside Terrace. It was considered that these features would have resulted in an unacceptable loss of privacy for the occupants of No. 1 Sunniside Terrace and the applicant has therefore removed them from the proposed development.

There are no windows proposed within the side elevation of the proposed single storey extension. Furthermore, there are no windows within the original side elevation of No. 1 Sunniside Terrace, although there is a secondary kitchen window located within the recently constructed rear extension at that property. However, given that this window in the side elevation of No. 1 Sunniside Terrace was provided as part of an extension and that it is a secondary window (with the main kitchen windows facing the rear), and also given that there is a high boundary fence in close proximity to this window, it is considered that the proposed extensions would not have an unacceptable impact on either the outlook from this kitchen window or result in an unacceptable loss of privacy.

In addition, although the application site is at a higher level than No. 1 Sunniside Terrace, given the location of the proposed extensions and the orientation of the dwellings, it is considered that the proposed extensions would not appear as an overdominant or overbearing structure when viewed from the habitable room windows or the garden of No. 1 Sunniside Terrace.

Given the orientation of No. 1 Sunniside Terrace and the location of the proposed extensions, it is considered that the proposed extensions would not result in an unacceptable level of overshadowing or loss of light over and above that of the existing situation.

With regard to the concern from the occupant of No. 1 Sunniside Terrace regarding increased noise levels associated with parties held within the applicant's rear garden as a consequence of it being enclosed by the proposed extensions, this matter has been considered by the Council's Environmental Health Team. They have advised that this would not be a reason to refuse the application on the grounds of its impact on the residential amenities of the occupants of No. 1 Sunniside Terrace. However, the Environmental Health Team would be able to investigate any complaints they receive regarding noise associated with parties etc.

Given the separation distance (approximately 23 metres) between the front elevations of the proposed extensions and the front elevation of No. 32a Sunniside Lane on the opposite side of the road, it is considered that the proposed development would not have an unacceptable impact on the residential amenities of the occupants of that property in terms of overdominace, overshadowing, privacy or outlook.

In addition, given the separation distance between the proposed extensions and No. 2 Sunniside Leigh to the north of the application site, it is considered that the proposed development would not have an unacceptable impact on the residential amenities of the occupants of that property in terms of overdominace, overshadowing, privacy or outlook.

It is considered that the proposed development would not result in an unacceptable impact on the residential amenities of the occupants of any nearby properties. As such, it is considered that the proposed development would be in accordance with NPPF, Policy DM1(B) of the South Tyneside Local Development Framework and the associated guidance contained within SPD9.

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

Dwg No AL(00)0201 rev A received 07/11/2019
Dwg No AL(00)0200 rev A received 07/11/2019
Dwg No AL(00)0222 rev A received 07/11/2019
Dwg No AL(90)0030 rev C received 07/11/2019
Dwg No AL(00)0225 received 07/11/2019
Dwg No AL(00)0224 rev A received 07/11/2019
Dwg No AL(00)0223 rev B received 08/11/2019
Dwg No AL(00)0202 rev A received 07/11/2019
Dwg No AL(00)0221 received 07/11/2019
Dwg No AL(00)0220 rev A received 07/11/2019

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 (including the facing brick and roof tiles) 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. All other external materials shall be as specified on the proposed elevation drawings (Drawing Numbers AL(00)0220 rev A, AL(00)0221, AL(00)0222 rev A, AL(00)0224 rev A and AL(00)0225 received 07/11/2019 and AL(00)0223 rev B received 08/11/2019). 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:
Signed:
Date:

Authorised Signatory:
Date: