DELEGATED REPORT / CASE OFFICER'S ASSESSMENT

Ref No: ST/0003/21/HFUL
Proposal: Single storey rear utility.w.c. extension. New pitched roof over existing single storey flat roofed offshot with rooflight to inner roof slope. Removal of 2no. chimneys. Canopy roof over new side entrance door. Associated alterations to external door/window arrangements. Recover roof with smooth red modern tiling. 'Natural white' render to entire bungalow. Replace existing white rainwater goods with black. Replace existing fascia/window framing with dark grey.

Location: 21 Central Avenue
South Shields
NE34 6AY

Site Visit Made: 04/02/21

Relevant policies/SPDs

1 DM1 - Management of Development (A & B)

2 SPD9 - Householder Developments

Description of the site and of the proposals

Planning permission is sought for the erection of a single storey rear extension, new pitched roof over existing single storey flat roof, removal of 2no. chimneys, installation of a side elevation canopy roof and associated alterations to the external render and fenestration at 21 Central Avenue; a semi-detached bungalow property. The site is located on the west of Central Avenue within the predominantly residential area of Harton.

The neighbouring site to the south side is semi-detached dwelling (no. 23 Central Avenue) and it is attached to the application property. To the north of the application property is a semi-detached dwelling (no. 19 Central Avenue). Beyond the rear gardens of these properties are semi-detached and detached dwellings situated on Central Gardens. Most of the properties are of a similar age with a select few new builds on Central Avenue.

The application seeks to add an infill single storey rear extension, with a pitched roof, which would project 2.9 metres from the existing rear wall of the property and would be flush with the original rear elevation outrigger.

The proposed pitched roof would measure 4.2 metres wide, matching the width of the existing single storey rear extension and measure 4.7 metres high, sitting 1.3 metres below the ridge of the existing dwelling.

The side elevation canopy that would also be added would be 0.3 metres in width, 0.9 metres in depth and would sit above the side door opening at a height of 2.9 metres.

The roof would be altered from profiled red roof tiles to 'smooth red modern' roof tiles. The application as originally submitted was for grey roof tiles but an amendment to this detail was requested and the applicant has replaced the proposal for grey tiles with red ones, to match the colour of the existing roof tile as closely as possible. There are examples of a smaller smooth red roof tile within the street but there are no examples of grey roof tiles.

The proposal includes covering the red facing brick of the property with 'natural white' render and there are examples of external render already found within this street.

The existing fenestration framing would be altered from white PVC to ‘dark grey’ framing.

The rainwater drainage system and guttering would be altered from white PVC to a black PVC.

Publicity / Consultations (Expiry date 11/02/2021)

1) Neighbour responses

1no. Objection;

The objector has stated that they do not agree with the proposed facing materials and states that these will detract from the uniformity of the surrounding bungalows. The objector also states that they do not agree with the size and depth of the proposed single storey rear extension and that it may affect the surrounding neighbouring amenity.

Assessment

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

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

Design/Visual Amenity

The proposed rear infill extension is considered to be a suitably designed rear extension, subservient in the context of the host property, proportionate in terms of its overall scale and massing. Its rear projection, at 2.9 metres in depth would not be over the recommended 3 metres for semi-detached dwellinghouses (as set out in the SPD9 planning guidance). It is also noted that the proposed extension would be flush with the original outrigger and that several properties along Central Avenue already benefits from a similar extension. (SPD9: paragraph 8.1).

The rear extension would not be visible from Central Avenue. It is considered that the proposed extension would have a neutral effect on the character and appearance of the street scene.

The proposed alteration of the existing rear extensions flat roof to a pitched is supported by SPD 9 as good practice, this proposal would make the existing extension a more subordinate addition to the host property.

The proposed canopy would be located above the side elevation door, the addition of a canopy is not precedented on Central Avenue but there are several side elevation extensions and porches within the surrounding area that could justify a refusal on design or visual amenity grounds.

The loss of the chimney would be visible from the public domain and would somewhat change the properties appearance. However, its loss is not considered to be something which, on its own, could justify refusal on design or visual amenity grounds (as the dwelling is not a designated asset and nor is it located in a sensitive location, such as within a conservation area).

The objection received against the proposal as initially submitted referred to the proposed facing materials. The Case Officer has spoken with the objector by telephone and has explained that the initial proposal to install grey roof tiles has now been replaced with a proposal to install red roof tiles but the

roof tile would remain smooth and the applicant prefers external render instead of the facing brickwork that currently exists.

Although profiled roof tiles would be preferred, it is not considered that smooth roof tiles would be that harmful to warrant refusal of the application. There are different roof tiles to the bungalows along the street with the smaller roof tile appearing smooth. The proposed external render would also change the appearance of the property but the applicant considers this to be an enhancement, this also includes the proposed external fixtures and the proposed fenestration framing changes. The render would not cause significant harm to the visual amenity of the area, as other examples already exist further along the street. Therefore, the application of external render, fenestration and fixtures is also not considered to be that harmful to the visual amenity of the area to warrant a refusal of the application. Indeed LDF Policy DM1 only seeks to ensure that development is sympathetic, it does not require development to be an exact match.

It is considered that the proposals would accord with LDF Policy DM1 (A) and the objectives of SPD9.

Residential Amenity

The proposals would not harm the amenities of the neighbours to the rear at Central Gardens, due to the nature and positioning of the development.

The neighbour to the north, no.19, would not have their amenities materially impact due to the rear extension being flush to the original outrigger making it unviewable from their property.

The adjoining neighbour to the south, no.23, benefits from an existing single storey rear offshoot that is a distance of 3 metres from the boundary with the application site. The proposed rear extension is relatively small in terms of its projection and height and as such, it would not add any addition loss of light constraints.

There is a potential ‘fall-back’ in terms permitted development rights (development that does not require planning permission from the council as local planning authority). These rights relate to rear extensions under 3 metre projection and that do not exceed half the width of the dwelling when forming a side extension to an offshot. The current proposal for the rear extension would only marginally appear to exceed these permitted development limits.

Given the size, massing and positioning of the proposal, it is considered that it would not have a detrimental impact on the neighbouring amenity particularly in terms of overshadowing, daylight, outlook or overdominance considerations.

It is also noted that there are no proposed side elevation windows to either flank.

Therefore the proposal will not cause significant harm to neighbouring amenity through impacts on outlook, or through overbearing, overshadowing or privacy impacts.

The proposed development is considered to be in accordance with Policy DM1 (B), while having regard to the principles set out in SPD 9.

Other Matters

A decision on this planning application will not dispose of the provisions of either the Party Wall etc. Act and / or the landowner rights of the adjoining neighbor.

Both are private non-planning matters, which the applicant is aware of (as well as the need for Building Regulations).

Summary

It is considered that, in the site circumstances and context of this particular case, that this proposal would be in accordance with Local Development Framework (LDF) policies DM1 (A & B), having regard to all other material planning considerations, including the design guidance in SPD9. The proposal is considered to be an acceptable form of development, subject to the inclusion of the suggested conditions.

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

Proposed Site/Roof Plan received 18/12/2020
Drawing No. 0794/4748/828 received 18/12/2020
Drawing No. 2 Revision A received 09/02/2021

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 as specified on drawing no. 2 revision A that was received on 9 February 2021 and as follows:

- 'Natural White' external render;
- Smooth red modern roof tiles (colour to match existing);
- Dark grey window and door framing; and
- Black PVC rainwater drainage system and guttering.

Unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority pursuant to this condition.

To ensure a satisfactory standard of development in the interests of visual amenity in accordance with adopted 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: James Kavanagh
Date: 09/02/2021

Authorised Signatory:
Date:

«END»