DELEGATED REPORT / CASE OFFICER'S ASSESSMENT

Ref No: ST/0529/20/HFUL
Proposal: Two storey extension to side and single storey rear extension. Insertion of windows at first floor level to the rear elevation of the rear projection. Enlargement of first floor window to front elevation. Canopy to front of property
Location: 3 Rydal Gardens
South Shields
NE34 0EB

Site Visit Made: 20/10/2020

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 northeast facing semi detached property in South Shields. The property has a hipped roof and to the rear there is a two storey projection. The property has a modest garden to the rear which is linked to the front of the property by a side passage.

This application seeks full planning permission to construct a two storey side extension, and a single storey rear extension. A canopy would be incorporated to the front of the property. Windows would be added at first floor level to the rear elevation of the existing rear projection.

Amended plans were received on 23rd November 2020 following officer concern regarding the impact upon the amenity of neighbouring properties. A revised site plan (existing and proposed) was submitted on 20th January 2021 to include the bay window to the rear of No. 4 Ambleside Avenue. The description was also amended to better reflect the proposed development. Neighbouring properties were renotified of the changes for 21 days on 4th February 2021.

Publicity / Consultations (Expiry date 25/02/2021)

1) **Neighbour responses - None**

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 visual and residential amenity.

LDF Policy DM1 seeks to preserve residential and visual amenity. SPD9 sets out guidance for householder developments.

Single Storey Rear Extension

SPD9 states that single storey rear extensions that would extend beyond the rear wall of the original dwelling house by up to 3 metres in respect of semi-detached or terraced houses will generally be acceptable.

The proposed single storey rear extension would be set 0.9m from the site's side boundary with the adjoining property, No. 5 Rydal Gardens and would project 3.6m from the main rear elevation of the host property parallel to this boundary. No. 5 has a window at ground floor level which is set approximately 1.5m from the shared boundary and which would therefore be 2.4m from the proposed single storey rear extension. Although the 3.6m projection would be in excess of the 3m standard as set out in SPD9, given the distance from the boundary and from that window, it is not considered that there would be significant adverse impact upon the residential amenity of No. 5 to warrant refusal and the projection of the rear extension is therefore considered to be acceptable.

The single storey rear extension would project 2.5m beyond the existing rear projection of the host property. It would be set 0.7m from the boundary with No. 4 Ambleside Avenue to the north and a minimum of 5m from that property. Given this distance and the single storey nature of the rear extension it is not considered that it would result in significant harm to the residential amenity of No. 4 particularly in terms of loss of outlook, overshadowing or overdominance.

No windows are proposed in the side elevations of the single storey rear extension. Therefore there would be no significant loss of privacy to No. 4 Ambleside Avenue or No. 5 Rydal Gardens. It is not considered that the proposed single storey rear extension would result in significant harm to the residential amenity of any other properties.

Two Storey Side Extension (including insertion of first floor windows to the existing rear elevation)
In terms of side extensions, SPD9 states two-storey and first floor side extensions can create a terracing effect within the street scene and give rise to inappropriate design. 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

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.

Given the layout of the site and surrounding dwellings it is not considered that the proposed side extension would lead to terracing. It would be set back from the front elevation of the host property by 1m and would have a significantly lowered roof ridge line which would be hipped, in keeping with that of the host property. The side extension would have a width of 1.35m which would be considerably less than the width of the host property. Consequently, the design of the two storey side extension would be subordinate to the host property. A gap of 0.7m would be retained between the side extension and the

side boundary. Although this would be less than the 1m standard as set out by SPD9, this would be by a small amount and, given that the design including the set back is acceptable and as set out below there would be an acceptable impact on residential amenity, this gap is considered to be acceptable on balance.

As existing, the host property is set 2.1m from the shared boundary with No. 4 Ambleside Avenue. No. 4 faces to the south and has a bay window at ground level in its rear elevation. At first floor level there is a bedroom window. No. 4 also has a two storey offshoot in its rear elevation which contains no windows. No. 4 is set at an angle to its shared boundary with the application property and so the distance from that boundary varies. The bay window is set 3.5m to 4.5m from the boundary and the bedroom window is set approximately 7m from the boundary.

The proposed two storey side extension would be 1.35m in width and therefore would be set 1.35m closer to No. 4 than the existing property. Consequently it would be set 2.15m to 3.15m from the bay window and approximately 5.65m from the bedroom window. The windows face to the south and so would not directly face the two storey side extension which is to the southeast of No. 4. The extension would be partially screened from the ground floor bay window by No. 4's existing rear two storey offshoot.

Given the orientation of the two properties, overshadowing would occur to No. 4 early in the morning, particularly to the ground floor bay window, but also to some extent to the bedroom window at first floor level. However this is the case at present and whilst the impact would be greater as a result of the proposed development, it would not result in such a significant increase so to warrant refusal. Such impact would only be early in the morning as when the sun moves around the sky later in the day, the proposed development would no longer result in overshadowing to No. 4. It is not considered that the proposed extension would lead to such a significant further level of overdominance or loss of outlook to warrant refusal, particularly as the windows in the rear of No. 4 predominantly face away from the proposed development which is to the southeast of No. 4. An exception to this would be the side window of the bay window. However this is partially obscured from the host property by No. 4's own two storey rear offshoot and that room is served by the other windows to the bay window which face away from the proposed development, and therefore there would not be such a severe level of harm to warrant refusal.

There would be no first floor windows in the side elevation of the proposed side extension. To the ground floor there would be 1no. door and 2no. windows which would serve a study and a bathroom. These windows would face the blank rear/side elevations of No. 4 Ambleside Avenue. As existing there are 3no. first floor windows and 2no. ground floor windows in the side elevation of the host property (which are set further to the rear than the proposed windows). Therefore it is not considered that there would be a significant loss of privacy to No. 4 as a result of the proposal.

There would be 1no. first floor window in the front elevation of the host property. This would not face directly towards any other property, given the orientation of the properties opposite it would face towards the gap between Nos. 2 and 4 Rydal Gardens. Consequently it would not lead to any significant loss of privacy. There would be 2no. windows inserted into the rear elevation of the rear extension / the existing projection at first floor level which would face towards the site's rear boundary at a distance of 13.5m. To the rear lies the car park of a care home. It is not considered that these windows would lead to a significant loss of privacy to any other property.

The two storey side extension would be screened from No. 5 Rydal Gardens by the existing two storey projection and so there would be no significant adverse impact upon the residential amenity of that property.

Front Canopy

The canopy proposed to the front would not result in significant harm to the residential amenity of any neighbouring properties and given its size and design would not result in significant harm to the visual amenity of the area.

Summary

In conclusion the proposal would have no significant adverse impact upon the residential amenity of any neighbouring properties, or the visual amenity of the area. Consequently the proposal would comply with all relevant local and national planning policy; the application is therefore recommended for approval.

Recommendation

Grant Permission Householder with Conditions

Conditions or Refusal Reasons [delete as appropriate]

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. C-02 rev A received 23/11/2020
Dwg no C-04 rev B received 20/01/2021

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: 01/03/2021

Authorised Signatory:
Date:

«END»