DELEGATED REPORT / CASE OFFICER'S ASSESSMENT

Ref No: ST/0603/21/HFUL
Proposal: Two storey side extension and pitched roof to ground floor front elevation.
Location: 38 King George Road
South Shields
NE34 0SN

Site Visit Made: 01/07/2021

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 seeks planning permission for a two storey side extension and pitched roof to ground floor front elevation at 38 King George Road, South Shields. The detached property is located at the corner of Cauldwell Place, Page Avenue and King George Road.

The side extension would comprise of a gable ended pitched roof and the roof ridge would be set down 0.4m from the roof ridge of the existing dwelling. The side elevation would follow the side elevation of the existing kitchen offshoot where the extension would also be constructed above. The front and rear elevations would not project beyond the front and rear elevations of the existing dwelling however the front elevation at ground floor level would match the existing porch front elevation. The side extension would measure a width of 2.8m and the side elevation would host 1 no. utility and 1 no. w.c. window. The rear first floor elevation would host an en-suite window and the first floor front elevation would host a bedroom window.

The existing front porch hosts a flat roof which would be replaced with a hipped roof. A pitched roof is proposed above the front elevation living room window which would create a canopy. A pitched roof is also proposed above the playroom window would match the same projection as the existing porch.

The proposed materials would be grey concrete tiles, facing brick and white upvc windows/doors to match existing. Also proposed is light grey render to the first floor front elevation to match the first floor front elevation of the side extension.

A number of detached properties along King George Road (no. 2, 10 and 12) host two storey side extensions. No. 2 hosts a first floor front elevation and roof ridge which are flush with the existing dwelling. No. 10 and 12 both host set backs of the front elevation at first floor level and set downs of the roof ridge.

Following further discussions, the plans were amended reducing the roof ridge so that it was set down from the roof ridge of the main dwelling and the first floor front elevation was set back from the front elevation of the main dwelling. The proposed living room bow window was also removed from the plans. The agent was advised that the description was amended removing the reference to the bow window.

Certificate B was signed in the planning application form when the planning application was submitted as the applicants were in the process of purchasing the property. The applicants now own the property.

Consultations (Expiry date – 30/08/2021)

1) **Neighbour responses**
Owner / occupier of 36 King George Road, South Shields

Initial comment

- The proposal will block light from our downstairs bathroom window, possibly the two skylights in our kitchen, our landing window, and our bathroom window. I feel this should be considered as this may have an effect on the lighting within our property.
- I have spent a considerable amount of time on turning our front garden into a wild garden. This can take a number of years for plants to grow and reducing light to the front garden will most likely have a significant effect on the growth of plants. Whilst I understand it will also reduce the amount of sunlight received on a morning, the morning sun is never as strong as the afternoon sun, so I will not raise this as a large issue, but wanted to highlight it.
- The footpath width between the extension boundary and the boundary of the application site measures 800mm. This is shorter than 1m so, as stated by yourselves, this will cause a terracing effect.

The neighbour also made comments in relation to the following –

- The drawings do not provide dimensions and should provide greater detail;
- Neighbour notification letters that are sent out and that we do not give people enough time to respond;
- Confusion over people being able to apply for planning permission when they do not own the premises;
- Concerns over construction work (if the scheme is permitted) – access to the property, building noise, building materials access/storage;
- Concerns over damage to their existing side footpath, building, existing fence and garden during the construction process.

Case officer note – Drawings are drawn to scale and therefore measurements are not required to be annotated on drawings. Issues throughout the construction phase are not planning related matters. Neighbour engagement is undertaken following the guidance from the combined statement of community involvement. All planning related matters are considered further in the report.

Second comment

- We receive little light we receive through our downstairs bathroom window. An extension will block even more light from here and possibly make us need to use the light more often. Our landing window will also suffer from the same issue.
- The extension would reduce the light to the front garden.
- Relating to part 7.2 of SPD 9 - The gap between the current property (single storey) being less than 1m, a two storey extension will cause a terracing effect.
- Figure 3.7 of SPD 9 – Extension on a corner plot - Would it not be better to suggest an extension to the south side of the property which follows good guidance given by the Council and will cause less hassle to neighbours as they are further away and are less likely to be overshadowed due to the extension now being on the south?
- The neighbour also made comments in relation to the following –
  Encroachment on to their land, building materials, access/storage, noise, and the front wall through the construction phase.

Case officer note – All planning related matters are considered further in the report.

Comments following amended plan

- Neighbour engagement of two weeks is too short.
- The amended drawings available in the planning portal do not have dimensions on.
- I still feel that an extension here will affect the front garden.

Case officer note – Neighbour engagement is undertaken following the guidance from the combined statement of community involvement. Drawings are drawn to scale and therefore

measurements are not required to be annotated on drawings. All planning related matters are considered further in the report.

Further comments following amended plan

- Concerns over the colour of the proposed render and the impact it would have on the street scene.

Case officer note – All planning related matters are considered further in the report.

Further Case officer note – All questions/comments were responded to in advance of this report.

2) Other Consultee responses
None

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 and Visual Amenity

As set out above, Policy DM1(A) requires extensions and alterations to an existing dwellinghouse to convey sensitive consideration to its surroundings; and where possible enhance its local setting and reinforce local identity, having particular regard to scale and proportions, alignment, form, use of materials and architectural detailing.

The application form states that the brick, roof tiles and windows would match the materials of the existing dwelling. The first floor front elevation of the existing dwelling hosts hanging tiles. The proposal is also to replace the hanging tiles with light grey render which would match the first floor of the proposed side extension.

There are a number of existing extensions found within the surrounding street scene, comprising a mixture of single and two storey side and rear extensions of a variety of sizes and designs. The neighbouring property of 56 King George Road has itself been extended to the side through the addition of a kitchen extension. No. 3 and 5 Page Avenue (semi-detached dwellings) are located to the side/rear of the applicant property and host two storey side extensions, both with some form of set back and set down. The adjacent neighbour made comment that the colour of the proposed render would not be sympathetic to the street scene. Brick and tile are the predominant materials used within the street scene, with a vast range of shades of render and pebble dash found on large a number of properties along the opposite side of King George Road to the application site. No. 27 King George Road (located on a corner plot on the opposite side of the road) is a semi-detached dwelling and hosts light grey render at first floor level. Although the grey does not match the cream render on the attached dwelling, the property has been tidied up by the addition of the grey paint. This property does not have planning permission for the grey render, planning permission is not required when painting a dwelling. It is also considered that a far less sympathetic colour could have been used whilst not requiring planning permission. The applicant property is a detached dwelling and due to the corner plot of the applicant property, the side elevation is the most prominent elevation and the proposed render would only be located along the front elevation.

The property is located on a prominent corner plot location and the side (south facing) elevation is visible to a large number of neighbouring properties. However the extension would be located on the north

facing side of the property and also host a roof ridge set down and first floor front elevation set back. As a result, it would not appear unduly prominent when viewed from the street.

The objection(s) received from the occupiers of the neighbouring property of 56 King George Road raised concerns that the gap between the side elevation of the extension and the side boundary (shared with no. 56 King George Road) would measure 800mm and not 1m and referred to part 7.2 of SPD 9 which states that a minimum 1m gap between the extension and the side boundary should be retained. Drawing no. 4 provides a measurement of the gap in-between the side boundary and the proposed side elevation of 650mm.

Guidance under part 7.2 of SPD 9 recommends that a minimum 1 metre gap between the extension and the side boundary of the application site is retained; a minimum 1 metre set-back between the front wall of the upper storey extension and the main front wall of the house is provided, the ridge line is significantly lowered and that the roof shape corresponds to the main dwelling.

In this instance the side elevation would be set back from the side boundary by 0.65m. Although this set-back would be 0.35m less than recommended by SPD 9, the difference is not considered to be significant, particularly as it follows the side elevation of the existing kitchen/garage. The first floor element of the side extension would be set back 0.45m from the front elevation of the existing dwelling, the side extension would host a lowered ridge line and host a pitched roof. Although the first floor front elevation would not be set back 1m, this guidance is aimed at semi-detached and high density housing detached properties. No. 38 King George Road is a detached property and is not located within a high density housing development. When combining the set backs and set downs listed above, it is not judged that the design of the extension would result in the creation of a terracing effect within the street scene; and would provide the extension with a subordinate appearance.

SPD 9 states that for detached dwellings with large front gardens, the extent of the extension will be determined by the available space and upon the character of the existing property. The front extension would match the projection of the existing front porch leaving a depth of 6m from the front elevation of the front extension to the front boundary. This is considered to not adversely impact upon the front garden or the character of the existing dwelling due to the existing form.

Taking into account the footprint of the existing dwelling, it is considered that the proposed extension would appear subordinate. The section of the proposed extension visible from King George Road would not have a width greater than half that of the host dwelling and, as highlighted, would also include a set-back from the front of the property. As a result, the proposal would not appear out of scale when compared to the original dwelling; and would not result in the overdevelopment of the site.

For these reasons, it is concluded that the development would not result in significant material harm to the amenity of surrounding residents; and would accord with LDF Policy DM1 (A) of the adopted South Tyneside Local Development Framework, the associated SPD9 and the requirements of the NPPF, which seeks to ensure a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings.

Residential Amenity Issues

The adjacent neighbour (no. 36 King George Road) is located north of no. 38 and there is a shared footpath in-between no. 36 and 38 along the common boundary. No. 36 hosts a single storey side extension which is constructed closer to the common boundary shared with no. 38 than the garage. The hipped roof hosts 2 no. roof kitchen lights and the side elevation facing no. 38 hosts a small obscure glazed w.c. window. At first floor level the side elevation of the original dwelling hosts a landing window and a high level obscure glazed bathroom window.

The first floor of the proposed extension at no. 38 would not project beyond the front and rear elevations of the existing dwelling. The front extension would project 1.4m forward of the main dwelling matching

the projection of the existing porch. As no. 36 is located further east in to the front garden, the front elevation of the front extension would only project 0.5m forward of the front elevation of the side extension at no. 36. The side elevation would be set back 0.65m from the common boundary shared with no. 36 which would match the side elevation of the existing kitchen/garage. The windows located along the side elevation would host a wc and utility. As the side path located in-between no. 36 and 38 is shared and therefore no boundary treatment, a condition has been included restricting the windows as obscure glazed in perpetuity; in order to protect the privacy of neighbouring occupiers.

The objection(s) received from the occupants of the neighbouring property of no 36 King George Road highlighted concerns that the proposed extension would block light to the downstairs bathroom window, the kitchen skylights, the landing and first floor bathroom window. It was also felt that it would cause a significant loss of natural daylight and sunlight to their front garden.

Supplementary Planning Document 9: Householder Developments (SPD 9) makes clear that a reasonable outlook should be maintained from the habitable room windows of neighbouring properties. This generally means that an extension should not be so large and/or so close that it forms a very dominant feature when looking out from habitable rooms of a neighbouring property. Further guidance set out within SPD 9 states that any proposed extension should not result in the significant overshadowing of habitable windows of neighbouring properties over and above that of the existing situation. The overshadowing of outdoor spaces is given less weight than impact within the dwelling.

The windows at 36 King George Road facing the applicant property host a landing and 2 no. bathrooms which are not habitable rooms. It is also considered that windows placed on side elevations cannot be protected if the adjacent neighbour wishes to built a side extension to the boundary. The 2no. roof lights host a habitable room, however 1no. roof light is located on the hipped (rear) pitch facing away from the adjacent neighbour.

As made clear by SPD 9, the overshadowing of outdoor spaces is given less weight than the impact within the dwelling. Notwithstanding this, the two storey element of the extension would be set down 0.4m from the roof ridge of the existing dwelling and the roof pitch slopes away from the neighbouring front garden.

Due to the corner plot location of no. 38 King George Road, the dwelling is visible to a number of properties along Page Avenue and Cauldwell Avenue. As the two storey element of the proposed extension would not extend beyond the front and rear elevations of the existing dwelling and taking in to account the distance in-between the applicant property and the rear/side neighbours, it is considered that the proposed development at no. 38 would not adversely impact the surrounding neighbours in terms of loss of out, privacy, over-shadowing or over-dominance.

It is considered for the reasons elaborated above that the proposal would be acceptable in relation to the impact on the residential amenities of the occupiers of the neighbouring properties and in accordance with Policy DM1 criterion B of the Local Development Framework Development Management Policies and the associated SPD9.

Impact on Highway Capacity and Road Safety

The Council's Traffic and Road Safety team (as the Highways Authority) were not consulted on this application as the garage which is accessed to the rear would remain unchanged. It is therefore judged that the proposals would be acceptable in highways terms and would be in accordance with LDF policy DM1 (G).

Conclusion

Subject to the schedule of planning conditions set out below, the proposed development would be acceptable in terms of its impact on visual and residential amenity, as well as highway capacity and road

safety. As such, it would accord with the relevant development plan policies and would be an acceptable form of development.

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 plans as detailed below:-

- Drg No. 1 - Received on 11/08/2021
- Drg No. 3b - Received on 11/08/2021
- Drg No. 4b - Received on 06/09/2021

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 materials for the proposed extension hereby permitted shall be as those stated in the application form (received 02/06/2021) and confirmation that the render would be a light grey colour; as confirmed in an email received from the agent (dated 09/09/2021). 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.

4 The windows along the northern elevation shown within the proposed side elevations on drawing no. 3b (received on 11 August 2021) facing the common boundary with 36 King George Road shall be glazed with obscure glass to a level sufficient to protect the privacy of neighbouring occupiers. The form of windows and obscure glazing shall be retained thereafter.

To ensure the protection of privacy for neighbouring occupiers, and in the interests of residential 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 (paragraphs 186 & 187) 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: Emma Thomas
Signed: Emma Thomas
Date: 27/09/2021

Authorised Signatory:
Date:

«END»