DELEGATED REPORT / CASE OFFICER'S ASSESSMENT

Ref No: ST/0562/20/HFUL
Proposal: Two storey side extension.
Location: 108 Brockley Avenue
South Shields
NE34 0TY

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 an east facing two storey semi detached dwellinghouse in South Shields. The property has a moderately sized front and rear garden which is linked by a passageway to the southern side.

This application seeks full planning permission to construct a two storey side extension. The originally proposed scheme was for a two storey side extension which had a front elevation flush to the property's principal elevation. Following officer concern in terms of design, a revised scheme was submitted reducing the depth of the proposed side extension at first floor level and setting it back by 2.283m at first floor level. Having regard to the Council's SCI, neighbours were not notified of these changes as the development was made smaller and it could not therefore materially affect their amenity relative to what they were notified upon.

Publicity / Consultations (Expiry date 15/10/2020)

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.

Section 3 of SPD9 sets out that in assessing planning applications for house extensions, 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, and that there is no unacceptable impact on the amenity of neighbours in relation to privacy, outlook and overdominance, and overshadowing.

SPD9 states that two-storey and first floor side extensions can create a terracing effect within the street scene and give rise to inappropriate design. Therefore proposals must have regard to the general principles set out in Section 3 of SPD9. 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.

In having regard to the general principles set out in Section 3, 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.

In those cases where the whole width of the plot is already built up by a single storey extension or garage, or where an existing single storey extension or garage has resulted in a gap along the common boundary of less than 1 metre, a first floor extension built up to the boundary may be acceptable where:

- it is set back behind the front wall of the main dwelling;
- it does not occupy more than two- thirds of the depth of the dwelling and is located towards the rear of the main dwelling;
- the roof ridgeline is significantly lower than the main dwelling ridgeline;
- a pitched or hipped roof, depending upon the existing dwelling and proposed extension design, is constructed on any residual flat roof of the original single storey structure in order to reduce the visual impact of the structure upon the proposed extension and street scene;
- a window is included to the front elevation of the proposed extension.

The proposed extension would have a single storey for the full depth of the property. The first floor element would be set back by 2.283m. The adjacent property to the south, No. 110 Brockley Avenue has a single storey side extension which spans the 2.5m gap between the boundary with the application site and the main property. Two storey side extensions can be found at Nos. 102 and 106 Brockley Avenue. No. 102's two storey side extension is set back from the property's principal elevation approximately 2m and was granted planning permission in 2005 (ref: ST/0022/05//DM). No. 106's two storey side extension is flush with the property's principal elevation but no planning record can be found.

As existing there is a gap of 2.5m between the southern gable of No. 108 and the site's southern boundary. This was previously partially filled by an outhouse which was set upon the site's southern boundary with No. 110 Brockley Avenue. The outhouse has recently been demolished. SPD9 requires that a 1m gap is retained between side extensions and the side boundary. However, SPD9 sets out criteria where a two storey side extension may be acceptable when the whole width of the plot is already built up by an extension or garage. In this case only part of the width was built up to the boundary, ie there was a gap between the outhouse and the main property, and the outhouse did not project the full depth of the property.

However, the proposal would comply with all of the requirements of SPD9 for when the whole width of the plot is already built up by an extension or garage, in that it would be set back considerably, by 2.83m, it would have a significantly lower roof ridge line and the roof would be pitched to match the host property, and there would be a window included to the front elevation. Given these factors, it is not considered that terracing would occur if the proposed extension was constructed, or should the adjacent property extend above their single storey extension in future (noting that the LPA would have control regarding the design of such an extension in terms of setback/lowered ridge height etc). In terms of width, the side extension would be acceptable: it would have a width which would be less than half of that of the host property. Consequently, it is not considered that there would be such a significant level of harm to the visual amenity of the area to warrant refusal. On balance the design would be considered to be acceptable.

The proposed extension would be set abutting the boundary with No. 110 Brockley Avenue. That property has a single storey side extension of 2.5m width upon the boundary which has a blank gable elevation. The gable elevation of the main property, set 2.5m from the boundary, contains one first floor window which serves a landing. The proposed extension would be set 2.5m from this window. No further overshadowing would occur due to the window's north facing orientation. The outlook from this window would be reduced from 5m to 2.5m. However, given that the window serves a non-habitable room, this would be considered to be acceptable. The extension would not project beyond the front or rear elevations of No. 110 Brockley Avenue. Consequently it is not considered that there would be significant harm to the residential amenity of that property.

The proposed development would be screened from No. 106 Brockley Avenue by the main bulk of the host property and so there would be no significant harm to the residential amenity of that property. Whilst the window to the front elevation of the side extension would face towards No. 55 Brockley Avenue, there would be a distance in excess of 25m between habitable room windows and it is not considered that this would significantly harm the level of privacy afforded by that property. Therefore there would be no significant level of harm to the residential amenity of No. 55. To the rear of the property are allotments and so the first floor rear windows would not result in significant loss of privacy to any residential properties. The proposal would have no significant harm on the residential amenity of any other properties.

It is also proposed to partially pave the front driveway to accommodate vehicle parking. This application does not seek permission for this work, however it would be able to be carried out under permitted development rights. It would also be permitted development to construct a dropped kerb to access the driveway from the highway.

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

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

A201 Rev B received 18/11/2020
A202 Rev B received 18/11/2020
A203 Rev C received 18/11/2020

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: 16/12/2020

Authorised Signatory:
Date:

«END»