

## **DELEGATED REPORT / CASE OFFICER'S ASSESSMENT**

**Ref No:** ST/0921/19/FUL  
**Proposal:** Single storey extension with new roof windows to existing roof  
**Location:** Talbot Medical Centre  
Stanley Street  
South Shields  
NE34 0BX

**Site Visit Made:** 30/01/2020

### **Relevant policies/SPDs**

- 1 DM1 - Management of Development (A, B C and G)
- 2 LDF CS SC1 - Creating Sustainable Urban Areas
- 3 SPD6 - Parking Standards

### **Description of the site and of the proposals**

The application site relates to Talbot Medical Centre in South Shields. The site is located just outside and to the west of the boundary of the Boldon Lane District Shopping Centre, as identified with the Local Development Framework Site Specific Allocations Proposals Map. The centre benefits from a 14-space car park for patients and visitors (including 1 disabled bay); and a small 3 space car park designated for staff.

Planning permission is sought for construction of a single storey extension to the building to provide additional consulting rooms the practice.

### **Publicity / Consultations** (Expiry date:30/01/2020)

#### **1) Neighbour responses**

None received

#### **2) Other Consultee responses**

Traffic and Road Safety: No issues but planners to check SPD6. Opposite corner may be considered for a no waiting at any time protection to prevent dangerous parking too close to the junction.

### **Assessment**

The main issues relevant to the assessment of this proposal are the;

- Design and impact on visual amenity;
- Impact on neighbouring amenity; and
- Highway capacity and safety

#### **Visual Amenity**

South Tyneside Local Development Framework (LDF) Policy DM1 (A) states that development, including extensions to existing buildings, should be designed to convey sensitive consideration of their

surroundings, and where possible enhance their local setting and reinforce location identity, having particular regard to scale, proportions, alignment, form, use of materials and architectural detailing.

The proposed extension would measure to under half the width of the existing building; and would maintain the eaves and ridge height of the main roof. As such, it would appear as a subordinate addition. The facing materials and architectural style of the extension would match existing.

It is therefore judged that the development would convey appropriate consideration of its surroundings, having regard to scale and proportions, use of materials and architectural detailing; and would accord with LDF Policy DM1 (A).

There is a small Birch tree in the north-west corner of the site, set within the existing tarmac parking area. The tree makes a limited contribution to visual amenity; and does not form an important part of the local landscape character. It is not protected by a Tree Preservation Order. Notwithstanding this, it is proposed to be retained as part of the development, with the canopy of the tree shown on the proposed floor plan to be outside the footprint of the proposed extension. As such, the proposal would comply with the requirements of LDF Policy DM1 (C) which requires new development to protect existing soft landscaping, including trees and hedges.

### Neighbouring Amenity

Policy DM1(B) requires a development to be acceptable in relation to any impact on residential amenity.

The application site is bounded by Stanley Street to the north (with the car park at Aldi to the other side of the road) and Ethel Terrace to the west (with the All Saints Community Association to the other side of this street). The nearest residential properties are located to the rear of the site along Beattie Street, separated by the back lane. The nearest residential dwellings benefit from high brick boundary walls, providing screening and preventing direct overlooking of habitable room windows from the 2 new windows proposed to the rear elevation of the extension.

Based on the size and scale of the extension to the building; and the position of the nearest dwellings, it is not judged that the development would result in harm to residential amenity in relation to loss of outlook, over dominance or overshadowing.

The main entrance to the health centre would be retained to its north elevation along Stanley Street, adjacent to the patient car park. As such, the additional consulting rooms would not result in any unacceptable increase in noise or disturbance for surrounding residents.

For these reasons, it is not considered that the development would result in material harm to the amenity of surrounding neighbours; and would accord with LDF Policy DM1 (B) as well as the requirements of the NPPF, which seeks to ensure a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings.

### Highway Capacity and Safety

Criterion G of the LDF policy DM1 requires the impact of the development to be acceptable in relation to highway capacity and safety.

Core Strategy Policy SC1 (Creating Sustainable Urban Areas) supports development which maintains and improves the provision of accessible basic local services and community facilities.

The Council's Traffic and Road Safety Team were consulted as local highway authority; and confirmed that they had no issues in relation to the proposed development, having considered traffic movements, vehicular access and layout. They did, however, recommend that Supplementary Planning Document 6: Parking Standards (SPD 6) was reviewed with respect to parking provision.

As clarified by the agent for the planning application, the development would result in an increase in staff levels at the site, with 1 new full-time member of staff and 2 part-time to be employed. The additional full-time member of staff would be clinical as will one of the new part-time members of staff. The second part-time member of staff will be non-clinical.

Under the requirements of SPD 6 for health centres, the maximum parking standards should be 3 spaces per health specialist, plus 1 space per 2 additional full-time staff. As the site is within the defined Urban Area, the maximum parking provision is reduced to 75% of this standard. A maximum of 5 parking spaces would therefore normally be expected to be provided for this proposal, due to the 2 additional health specialists to be employed.

Although the development would result in the loss of 3 designated car parking spaces at the site (rather than providing any increase), it is considered that this additional parking requirement can be accommodated within the surrounding area without detriment to highway safety. On-street parking is widely available along Stanley Street, Ethel Terrace and Beattie Street, while the adjacent customer car park at Aldi offers the potential to be used for parking for combined trips.

It is also considered that this parking requirement can be off-set by the accessible location of the site. As well as being located within a predominantly residential area to the edge of the Boldon Lane District Shopping Centre, the site is within easy walking distance of the closest bus stops along Boldon Lane, while the nearest metro station at Tyne Dock is approximately 480 metres walking distance.

The total gross internal floorspace of the building following the works would be under the minimum threshold for which a travel plan would be required to be submitted in support of the development.

Taking into account the accessible location of the site, including the availability of public transport, as well as the on-street parking available within the surrounding streets (and the size of the in-curtilage car park to be retained for patients), it is not considered that the development would result in an adverse impact on highway capacity and safety; and would accord with the objectives of LDF Policy DM1 (G).

### **Conclusion**

It is considered that the development would be in accordance with the relevant Local Development Framework policies and the requirements of the NPPF.

In assessing this application due regard has been had to the requirement of section 149 of the Equality Act 2010.

### **Recommendation**

Grant Permission 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

Drawing Number 2 Proposed received on 20/12/2019

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](http://www.gov.uk/government/organisations/the-coal-authority)

**Case officer:** Joshua Kenolty

**Signed:**

**Date:** 13/02/2020

**Authorised Signatory:**

**Date:**

«END»