DELEGATED REPORT / CASE OFFICER'S ASSESSMENT

Ref No: ST/0566/20/HFUL
Proposal: Side extension single storey. Alteration of vehicle crossing and dropped kerb.
Location: 53 Temple Park Road
South Shields
NE34 0PU

Site Visit Made: 30/10/2020

Relevant policies/SPDs

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

2 SPD9 - Householder Developments

Description of the site and of the proposals

This application relates to a south facing semi detached dwellinghouse in South Shields. The property sits at the end of a row of pairs of semi detached houses which run to the west. To the east of the site there is the junction of Temple Park Road and Bisley Drive which is pedestrianised. The property itself has a large area of hardstanding to its eastern side. To the front of the property there is a paved driveway. The property is separated from the road by a grass verge. A paved vehicle crossing crosses the verge diagonally to reach the road.

This application seeks full planning permission to erect a hipped roof single storey side extension upon the area of hardstanding. Permission is also sought to construct a vehicle crossing across the grass verge between the driveway and the road, and to construct a dropped kerb. The existing crossing would be grassed over.

Publicity / Consultations (Expiry date 29/10/2020)

1) **Neighbour responses**

None

2) **Other Consultee responses**

Traffic & Road Safety

Recommend Approval

Accepted but can't find the change to the dropped kerb therefore any changes to this will need to be discussed and approved by construction team before proceeding.

STC construction team to make any adjustments to dropped kerb (if approved)

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 and states that single storey extensions should not normally have a width greater than half the width of the existing property. To preserve the character of the street scene, single-storey extensions on corner plots should not extend beyond the established building line of the return 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 proposed extension would have a width of 2.9m which would be less than half the width of the host property. There would be a 2.5m gap between the extension and the eastern side boundary. Consequently the extension would comply with SPD9 in this regard. In terms of design, the hipped roof would be acceptable and would not significantly harm the character and appearance of the area.

The side extension would be set a minimum of 0.96m from the northeastern boundary of the site which is shared with No. 1 Bisley Drive. That property, however, is set well back from the boundary and its southwestern corner would be approximately 6m from the northeastern corner of the proposed extension. Given that distance and the single storey nature of the extension, with a roof which would hip away from No. 1, it is not considered that there would be significant harm upon the residential amenity of No. 1 Bisley Drive, particularly in terms of overshadowing, overdominance or loss of outlook, There would be two windows in the rear elevation of the extension which would face to the north. These would not face directly towards No.1 and so there would be no significant loss of privacy to that property.

The extension would be screened from the attached property, No. 51 Temple Park Road, by the main bulk of the host property and so there would be no significant loss of residential amenity upon No. 51 as a result of the proposed extension. The proposed extension would not result in any significant harm to the residential amenity of any other properties.

It is also proposed to construct a vehicle crossing across the grass verge. It would be constructed slightly to the west of the existing crossing at an angle to the road, partially overlapping the existing crossing. A dropped kerb is proposed to align with the new crossing. SPD9 notes that planning permission will be required in circumstances where the vehicle crossing will open on to a classified road. Where planning permission is required, there will be a general presumption against those proposals that would unreasonably impact upon the local highway network, whilst the siting of a crossing should have regard to the design layout of your estate.

The Council's Traffic and Road Safety team have raised no objections to the proposal, although note that separate approvals would be required prior to construction, which would need to be undertaken by the Council's construction team. An informative is proposed to notify the applicant of this.

The existing crossing would be returned to grass verge (where it would not overlap with the proposed crossing). Therefore, whilst some grass verge would be lost, some would also be regained, and so there would be no net loss of grassed area. Furthermore, there are no highway or road safety concerns. Consequently, the proposed crossing and dropped kerb are considered to be acceptable.

Summary

In conclusion the proposal would have no significant adverse impact upon the residential amenity of any neighbouring properties, the visual amenity of the area, or highway safety. 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

"Existing / Proposed elevations & floor plans" received 08/07/2020
"Existing / Proposed Site Plans" received 24/08/2020

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

3 Alterations to the adopted highway/footway to create or widen a vehicular footway crossing will require the approval of the Council as Local Highway Authority. Please see https://www.southtyneside.gov.uk/article/38198/Dropped-kerbs-and-crossovers or call 0191 427 7000 for further information.

Case officer: Seán Gallagher
Signed:
Date: 15/12/2020

Authorised Signatory:
Date:

«END»