

DELEGATED REPORT / CASE OFFICER'S ASSESSMENT

Ref No: ST/0691/21/HFUL
Proposal: Resubmission of application ST/0074/21/HFUL. Two storey side extension.
Location: 59 Iona Road
Jarrow
NE32 4HY

Site Visit Made: 12/08/2021

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 relates to a north facing two storey semi detached property in Jarrow. The property has a hipped roof and occupies a corner plot. There is a rear garden and a wrap around front and side garden.

Planning permission was sought and refused in May 2021 (ref: ST/0074/21/HFUL) for a two storey side extension at this property. That proposed extension had a width of 5.5m and the front elevation of the extension was set back by 0.3m with the roof being set down by 0.1m. That application was refused for the following reason:

"The proposed two storey side extension, by reason of its overall excessive width in relation to the main dwelling (and insignificantly lowered ridgeline), would have an adverse impact on the appearance of the host dwelling, the adjoining semi-detached property and it would result in an incongruous and over-dominant structure that would be materially detrimental to the character and appearance of the street scene of which the property forms a part. The proposed development would not therefore accord with Policy DM1(A) of the South Tyneside Local Development Framework and the associated guidance contained within SPD9: Householder Developments."

This application seeks full planning permission to construct a two storey side extension. The side extension would have a width of 4m. The extension would be set back by 0.3m at first floor level with the roof being set down by 0.1m

Publicity / Consultations (Expiry date 18/08/2021)

- 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 and sets out the following in relation to two storey side extensions relevant to this application):

- 7.2 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.

- 7.3 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.

- 7.4 The council recognises that the above guidance may not be suitable in all situations and that the design and suitability of an extension is dependent upon the site-specific circumstances, the need to protect residential and visual amenity and to achieve a design that respects the scale, character and appearance of the dwelling and its neighbourhood, having regard to the general principles set out in Section 3 of SPD9. In some cases the above guidance may be relaxed if two or more of the following criteria exist:
- there is a marked stagger in the building line between the dwelling and the affected neighbour;
 - the dwelling to be extended is of a substantially different type, scale and massing to the adjacent dwelling;
 - the adjacent property is incapable of being extended in the same direction; and
 - there is a significant difference in ground levels between the dwellings to be extended and the affected neighbour.

- 7.6 To preserve the character of the street scene two-storey side extensions and first floor side extensions on corner plots should not extend beyond the established building line of the return side 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.

Impact on Visual Amenity

The main design issues to consider are whether the scale, massing, design, proportions and location of the extensions are appropriate, having regard to the size and character of the existing property and pair of semi detached properties, considering its relationship with the surrounding street scene.

The proposed extension would have a width of 4m. The existing dwelling has a width of 6.29m. Consequently the width of the proposed extension would not comply with SPD9 in that it would be significantly more than half the width of the host property (which would be 3.15m). The site is a set on a corner plot of Iona Road and Lanark Drive. There is no clear building line along the return street (Lanark Road). Therefore in this case SPD9 would require a 2m gap between the proposed extension and the site boundary and a 4.25m gap would remain.

Paragraph 7.2 of SPD9 notes that where terracing would not occur, 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. The front elevation of the extension would be set back by 0.3m from the principal elevation of the host property and no set back would be provided. The ridge of the roof would be just 0.1m lower than the main roof of the host property.

Due to the excessive width of the extension and also the design of the extension with minimal set back at first floor level and minimal set down from the main roof, and whilst it is acknowledged that no terracing would occur, it is considered that the proposed two-storey side extension would not appear as a subordinate addition to the existing pair of semi-detached properties, would not complement the scale and proportions of the original property. As a result, it is considered that the extension would not convey a sensitive consideration of its surroundings, would fail to reinforce local identity, and would cause a substantial degree of harm to the character of the property, the pair of semi-detached properties, and the street scene as a whole.

It is acknowledged that paragraph 7.4 of SPD9 notes that the guidance of SPD9 can be relaxed if two of the criteria as set out are met, and whilst the criteria do not directly relate to this type of site (there is no immediately adjacent property), the guidance can still be relaxed on a case by case basis. However, it is not considered appropriate to relax the guidance in this case as the proposed two storey side extension, by reason of its overall excessive width when compared to the main dwelling and due to its scale and mass would have an adverse impact on the appearance of the host dwelling, the adjoining semi-detached property and it would result in an incongruous and over-dominant structure that would be materially detrimental to the character and appearance of the street scene of which the property forms a part. The proposal would not be visually subordinate to the host dwelling and would significantly unbalance the semi-detached pair of properties detracting from the appearance of the street scene. The development would not therefore accord with Policy DM1(A) of the South Tyneside Local Development Framework.

Impact on Residential Amenity

Given the location of the extension, it would not result in any overshadowing or loss of outlook to any properties. The first floor windows to the front and rear would overlook a playing field and garages respectively and so would not result in any loss of privacy to any neighbouring properties. There would be a window in the side elevation of the proposed extension at first floor level which would directly face the side elevation of Nos. 61 and 63 Iona Road (a pair of flats). However a distance of approximately 25m would separate that window and those properties and so given this distance there would be no significant loss of privacy to Nos. 61 and 63. It is not considered that the proposal would result in harm to the residential amenity of any neighbouring properties.

Summary

In conclusion the proposal would have no significant adverse impact upon the residential amenity of any neighbouring properties. However, it would result in significant harm to the visual amenity of the area for the reasons outlined above. The applicant was provided an opportunity to amend the proposed in order to overcome these concerns however no response was received. The proposed development would be

contrary to LDF Policy DM1 and the guidance as set out in SPD9. Consequently, the application is recommended for refusal.

Recommendation

Refuse Householder Permission

Refusal Reasons

- 1 The proposed two storey side extension, by reason of its overall excessive scale and lack of subservience in relation to the host dwelling, would have an adverse impact on the appearance of the host dwelling, the adjoining semi-detached property and it would result in an incongruous and over-dominant structure that would be materially detrimental to the character and appearance of the street scene of which the property forms a part. The proposed development would not therefore accord with Policy DM1(A) of the South Tyneside Local Development Framework and the associated guidance contained within SPD9: Householder Developments.

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. However, the proposed development is contrary to the policies referred to in the reason(s) for refusal and it has not been possible to reach an agreed solution in this case.

Case officer: Seán Gallagher

Signed:

Date: 19/08/2021

Authorised Signatory:

Date:

«END»