DELEGATED REPORT / CASE OFFICER'S ASSESSMENT

Ref No: ST/0920/21/HFUL
Proposal: Two storey extension at side of house to provide a bedroom and bath en-suite at first floor, with a playroom/study and w.c./shower room at ground floor. A replacement entrance porch at the front, and a new tiled roof to the existing flat roof at the front. A new single storey extension at the rear of house to provide an enlarged kitchen/dining/lounge area.
Location: 22 King George Road
South Shields
NE34 0SN

Site Visit Made: 05/10/2021

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, a single storey rear extension, replacement entrance porch at the front and a new tiled roof to the existing flat roof at the front at 22 King George Road, South Shields. The semi-detached property is located within a well-established residential area of South Shields. The path in-between no. 22 and 20 King George Road is shared (with no visible boundary) and the existing garage at no. 22 is set back 0.75 metre from the common boundary.

The side extension would measure a width of 3.25 metre, the first floor front elevation would be set back 0.75 metre from the front elevation of the original dwelling and the rear elevation would fall flush with the rear elevation of the existing dwelling. The side elevation would be set back 0.25 metre from the side boundary and the pitched roof ridge would be set down 0.3 metre from the roof ridge of the existing dwelling. At first floor level the front elevation would host a bedroom window and the rear elevation host the en-suite window. The side elevation would host 1 no. first floor bedroom window, and at ground floor level there would be 3 no. high level obscure glazed (and permanently closed) windows; 2 no of which hosting the playroom and 1 no. window hosting the w.c/shower. A new high level window is also proposed along the side elevation of the existing garage which would also be obscure glazed and permanently close.

The existing front porch and canopy host a flat roof which would be replaced with a pitched roof. The proposed front extension in front of the two storey side extension would measure the same height and projection as the existing front porch.

The rear extension would project 3 metre from the rear elevation of the original dwelling, measure a width of 5.7 metre and be constructed to the side boundary shared with the attached neighbour. The eaves height would measure 2.6 metre and roof ridge height measure 3.5 metre. The pitched roof would host 2 no. velux windows and the rear elevation would host bifold doors.

The proposed materials would be grey tiles, red/brown facing brick and white upvc windows/doors to match existing. The rear bi-fold doors would be finished in dark grey alloy.

Consultations (Expiry date – 18/10/2021)

1) **Neighbour responses**
None received

2) Other Consultee responses
None

Relevant Planning Policy and Guidance

Local Development Framework Development Management Policies (adopted December 2011)

Policy DM1 Management of Development

In determining all applications under the planning Acts we will ensure that, where relevant:

A the development, including new buildings, extensions and alterations to existing buildings, is designed to convey a sensitive consideration of 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;

B the development is acceptable in relation to any impact on residential amenity;

Local Development Framework Supplementary Planning Document 9: Householder Developments (adopted December 2010, revised January 2014)

In terms of encouraging good design Section 3 'General Design Guidance and Objectives' notes that in assessing 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'.

Section 7 provides specific guidance relating to '*Two Storey Side and First Floor Side Extensions*'. Some key points of the guidance are highlighted in paragraph 7.2.

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.*

Paragraph 7.3 gives consideration to the width of proposed extensions.

7.3 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.

With regard to single-storey front extensions, SPD9 states:

5.2 In the case of terraced and semi-detached houses, front extensions should not normally project forward from the original dwelling by more than 1.4 metres and side windows should be avoided

or fitted with obscure glazing in situations where there would otherwise be an adverse impact on the privacy of a neighbour.

With regard to single-storey rear extensions, SPD9 states:

8.1 Single-storey rear extensions that would extend beyond the rear wall of the original dwelling house by up 3 metres in respect of semi-detached or terraced houses will generally be acceptable.

Assessment

Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires that an application for planning permission must be determined in accordance with the adopted development plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

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 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 host property, and considering its relationship with the surrounding street scene.

Two Storey Side Extension

The proposed two-storey side extension displays some characteristics that are consistent with paragraph 7.2 of SPD9. It would provide a roof line that corresponds with the existing property and would provide some set-down from the ridge height of the main property (0.3 metre).

However, the proposal also fails to accord with the provisions of SPD9 in a number of other respects. The extension would be located very close to the side boundary (0.25 metre gap), which is substantially below the 1 metre gap from the side boundary that SPD9 advises is ordinarily necessary to ensure that two-storey side extensions on semi-detached properties have a subordinate appearance, and do not create an unacceptable degree of terracing effect. The impact of this extension is also exacerbated in this case by the width of the proposed extension (approx. 3.2 metres), which also exceeds the design guidance in paragraph 7.3 of the SPD, and states that side extensions should not be more than half of the width of the original dwelling frontage (approx. 2.95 metres in this case). Additionally, the first floor front elevation would be set back 0.75 metre which is 0.25 metre below the 1 metre set back standard that is set out within the council's SPD9 guidance. When taking the above into account, it is considered that the proposed two storey side extension would not appear subordinate to the existing dwelling and that it would create the unwanted terracing effect within the street scene (the existing character of the street has been unaltered at first floor level).

Furthermore, if allowed the proposed two storey side extension would set an unwanted precedent for other properties to build (and cause a harmful terracing affect) both adjacent and along this section of King George Road to the detriment of the visual amenity of this area.

The host property and others in the vicinity are predominantly built with a red brick exterior, but some also with substantial rendered areas, which vary from property to property, and are usually white in colour, or with white cladding. The application property itself currently has a predominantly brick exterior

at present. The external materials proposed (red brick and dark grey roof tiles) would match the existing dwelling and are considered to be acceptable.

Contact was made with the applicant (as no planning agent was listed on the application form) setting out the council's planning policies in regard to the need for subordinate design and the harmful impacts of terracing within the street scene. An opportunity was provided for the applicant to consider whether they wished to make any amendments to the proposal so that it could be brought in line with these policies. However, the applicant has requested that the application be determined as it stands.

The applicant's response also referred to a number of dwellings along King George Road stating that these dwellings host first floor/two storey side extensions which are not set back from the side boundary by more than 1 metre; they appear to range between a 0.5-0.75 metre set back. The applicant later provided a list of the said properties with no. 7, 13, 15 and 19 King George Road being located closest to the applicant property on the opposite side of the road. Having looked at the planning application history of these properties, no. 7, 13 and 15 provide a 1 metre set back of the first floor front elevation from the main dwelling and a lower ridgeline and the side extensions are located no closer to the side boundary than 0.8 metre. Although no. 19 hosts a side extension which is built along the side boundary and the first floor front elevation is flush with the front elevation of the existing dwelling, the roof ridgeline is significantly lower than the roof ridgeline of the main dwelling and planning permission for the two storey side extension was given in 1985 under superseded planning policy and the extension would not meet the current SPD9 guidance by which this application is being assessed.

The applicant also referenced the width of the proposed side extension and that many dwellings along King George Road host side extensions which are wider than what is being proposed, that houses with the single storey side extensions could at some point decide to build up which is what these proposed plans are and the majority of neighbours who have a single storey extension at the side of their property have extended by 15cm (no 20.) and 45cm (no.18 & 16). All of these properties host single storey side extensions and therefore are not comparable to the current planning application for 22 King George Road. If these properties wished to apply for planning permission in the future for a first floor side extension, then these would be assessed on their own merit.

In terms of the character of the street scene, King George Road itself is a very wide road hosting two dual carriage ways with a grassed / tree-lined area in-between. The dwellings listed above are located on the opposite side of King George Road to the applicant property and both sides of the road feel very much separate to one another, particularly with the trees located on the grassed area in the middle of the road. It is considered that the extensions on the opposite side of the road have an unsympathetic impact on the character of the street scene however do not affect the street scene where the applicant property is located, as elaborated above. No. 22 is located centrally within 6 no. pairs of semi-detached dwellings (no. 14-36 King George Road) and none of these properties host a two storey side extension, nor do any have planning permission for a two storey side extension which is either extant or yet to be built.

Policy DM1(A) requires all development to convey sensitive consideration of its surroundings. The current proposal for the two storey side extension at no. 22 would be an unsympathetic addition to the property as it would not appear subordinate to the existing dwelling and would create a terracing effect within the street scene. It would also set a precedent for other properties to build two storey side extensions along this section of King George Road which would further exacerbate the terracing effect along the row of semi-detached dwellings. The development would not therefore accord with Policy DM1(A) of the South Tyneside Local Development Framework.

<u>Single Storey Front Extension</u>

SPD 9 advises that front extensions should not normally project forward from the original dwelling by more than 1.4 metre and side windows should be avoided or fitted with obscure glazing in situations where there would otherwise be an adverse impact on the privacy of a neighbour. In this case the front canopy would project 0.8 metre forward and the porch / side extension would project 1.7 metre forward

of the front elevation of the main dwelling. When considering the existing porch projects 1.7 metre forward of the front elevation, the addition of the side/front extension projecting the same projection is considered to be not overly dominant and be in keeping with the character of the main dwelling. Furthermore no windows would be located along either side elevations which complies with advice contained in SPD9 and is therefore considered acceptable.

Single Storey Rear Extension

The proposed single storey rear extension would be appropriately scaled in the context of the host property, and although it would be visible from Cauldwell Place (the road which runs along the rear boundary), it would not be visible within the street scene along King George Road, so would have no material effect on the wider surroundings. This aspect of the scheme is considered to be acceptable and in accordance with Policy DM1(A) and the associated SPD9.

Residential Amenity

Two Storey Side Extension

The adjacent neighbour (no. 20 King George Road) is located north of no. 22 and there is a shared footpath in-between no. 20 and 22 along the common boundary. The proposed two storey extension would extend towards the adjacent property at 20 King George Road. The side elevation facing towards this property would host a number of windows however they would all be obscure glazed, meaning that there would be no potential overlooking or privacy impacts towards this property arising as a result of the development.

No. 20 hosts a first floor landing window which is not a habitable room and also a small bathroom window. The bathroom also hosts a larger window along the rear elevation which is considered the primary window. There is also a window along the side elevation of the single storey side extension facing no. 22. 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 proposed side extension would not project beyond the front and rear elevations of the existing dwelling, therefore the two storey extension would not be visible from the first floor front/rear elevation windows at no. 20. This would also be the case for the attached neighbour (no. 24 King George Road). It is therefore considered that the proposed development at no. 22 would not adversely impact the adjacent neighbour in terms of loss of out, privacy, over-shadowing or over-dominance.

The proposed extensions would be visible to a number of properties along Cauldwell Place and King George Road, however the neighbouring properties are located at a far away enough to not be adversely impacted by the development at no. 22 King George Road.

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.

Single Storey Front Extension

It is not considered that this aspect of the proposals would have any potential to impact upon the attached neighbour in terms of residential amenity. The proposed front extension would project 1 metre forward of the front elevation of the side extension at no. 20. However there would be a 1 metre between the facing side elevations of no. 20 and 22.

Single Storey Rear Extension

The attached neighbour (no. 24 King George Road) is located south of the applicant property. The proposed single storey rear extension would have a 3 metre projection, would measure a ridge height of 3.5 metre and would be located along the side boundary shared with no. 24 where a 1.9 metre high fence is situated. No windows are proposed along the side elevation directly facing no. 24. Although no. 24 hosts dining room patio doors along the rear elevation close to the common boundary shared with no. 22 and may be impacted by the proposed rear extension in terms of loss of outlook and over-dominance, it would be a marginal impact, especially conserving the orientation of both properties. It also has to be considered that a single storey rear extension projecting 3 metre could be constructed along the side boundary without requiring planning permission (if not attached to any other extension).

The rear extension would not have any impact upon the adjacent neighbour (no. 20 King George Road) as the rear extension would not extend beyond the existing garage which is located near the side boundary shared with no. 20.

It is considered 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(B) of the Local Development Framework Development Management Policies, and the associated SPD9.

Summary

For the reasons elaborated above, the proposed two storey side extension is not considered to be an acceptable form of development and is recommended for refusal for the reason outlined below. Whereas the remaining elements of the proposed development are acceptable and would accord with policy for the reasons set out above.

Recommendation

Refuse Householder Permission

Refusal Reason

1 The proposed two storey side extension, by reason of its close proximity to the boundary with 20 King George Road, its excessive width in relation to the host dwelling and its lack of a sufficient set-back from the front wall of the host dwelling at first floor level, would have an adverse impact on the appearance of the host dwelling and wider street scene.

In addition, it is considered that the proposed two storey side extension would create an unacceptable terracing effect within the street scene, particularly if the neighbouring property at 20 King George Road were to be extended in a similar manner in future. For these reasons, this extension would be materially detrimental to the character and appearance of the street scene of which the property forms a part.

As such the proposed two storey side extension would not be sympathetic to its site or surroundings, would be harmful to visual amenity and it would not accord with Policy DM1(A) of the South Tyneside Local Development Framework.

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.

List of plans for standard note

Plan Reference

- Sheet 1 Proposed Plans received 23/08/2021
- Sheet 2 Proposed Ground Floor Plan received 23/08/2021
- Sheet 3 Proposed Front Elevation and First Floor Plans received 23/08/2021
- Sheet 4 Proposed Side Elevations and Existing Site/Roof Plan received 23/08/2021
- Sheet 5 Proposed Rear and Side Elevations and Proposed Site/Roof Plan received 23/08/2021

Case officer: Emma Thomas
Signed: Emma Thomas
Date: 23/12/2021

Authorised Signatory:
Date:

«END»