DELEGATED REPORT / CASE OFFICER'S ASSESSMENT

Ref No: ST/1206/21/HFUL
Proposal: Erection of side extension, installation of velux windows and erection of dormer window to rear.
Location: 44 King George Road
South Shields
NE34 0SU

Site Visit Made: 13/01/2022

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 an east facing semi detached dwellinghouse in South Shields. The property has a hipped roof and to the southern side there is a single storey hipped roof garage.

This application seeks full planning permission to construct a hip to gable roof extension, a rear box dormer, and a first floor side extension above the garage.

Following officer concern regarding design, amended plans were submitted on 28/01/2022. Following receipt of these amendments, neighbours were not re-notified of the application having regard to the Council's SCI, for the proposed changes to the scheme would have no further material impact on neighbouring properties over and above the plans that they were originally notified of.

Publicity / Consultations (Expiry date 28/01/2022)

1) **Neighbour responses – None received**
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.

It is proposed to construct a hip to gable roof extension. This would be able to be constructed under permitted development rights and so it would not be appropriate to refuse the application based upon this element. Following the hip to gable extension, a box dormer would be constructed to the rear roof slope. Again, this would be able to be constructed under permitted development rights and so it would not be appropriate to refuse the application based upon this element. The roof windows to the front roof slope would also be permitted development.

It is also proposed to construct a first floor side extension above the existing garage. The two storey side extension would have a pitched roof which would be set down from the main roof of the host property and the first floor of the side extension would be set back by 0.66m from the principal elevation of the host property.

With regard to first floor side extensions, SPD9 notes at paragraph 7.5 that in cases such as this where an existing single storey extension or garage has resulted in a gap along the common boundary of less than 1 metre, a first floor extension built up to the boundary may be acceptable where:

- it is set back behind the front wall of the main dwelling;

- it does not occupy more than two- thirds of the depth of the dwelling and is located towards the rear of the main dwelling;
- the roof ridgeline is significantly lower than the main dwelling ridgeline;
- a pitched or hipped roof, depending upon the existing dwelling and proposed extension design, is constructed on any residual flat roof of the original single storey structure in order to reduce the visual impact of the structure upon the proposed extension and street scene;
- a window is included to the front elevation of the proposed extension.

The proposed side extension would satisfy these criteria apart from the requirements for a set back of two thirds. However, there are a number of first floor side extensions in the surrounding area of a variety of styles, some of which do not display such a set back, such as at Nos. 52 and 64 King George Road. Whilst a two third set back would be preferred, it is considered that in this case the side extension would demonstrate subordinance through its lowered roof height. The site is set back from the main road and whilst the pair of semi detached dwellings are on a corner, the site itself is not on the corner. Furthermore, the applicant has stated that the proposed internal layout would mean that an increased set back would render the internal layout as unusable. The proposed extension would satisfy the remaining criteria as set out in SPD9 and above. Additionally, the width of the extension would satisfy the requirements of paragraph 7.3 of SPD9 which states that side extensions should not be more than 3 metres in width or be more than half of the width of the original dwelling frontage. Having regard for the above, the proposed side extension would demonstrate subordinance in its overall design and therefore, on balance, this is considered to be acceptable.

Whilst a pitched roof is proposed which would not be in keeping with the surrounding area, where the majority of properties are semi detached hipped roof dwellings, it is considered that given the proposed hip to gable roof extension (which as set out above would be permitted development), a pitched roof extension would give the best overall design. The applicant did initially submit a revised scheme showing a hip to gable extension to the main dwelling (ie a pitched roof) and a hipped roof side extension. It was not considered that this approach gave a good standard of design as the two roof styles on the same property appeared to clash with each other. Consequently, following discussions with the case officer, the applicant submitted the scheme that is being considered.

The proposed hip to gable roof extension and box dormer would be able to be constructed under permitted development rights. Views would be afforded from the windows in the rear elevation of the box dormer across the rear gardens of Page Avenue to the west although the dormer's windows would not directly face any windows of any other properties. Nevertheless, these two elements would be able to be constructed under permitted development rights and so it would be unreasonable to refuse the application based upon any impacts of these aspects.

The first floor side extension would be screened from No. 42 King George Road to the north by the main bulk of the host property and so there would be no significant harm to that adjoining neighbour.

The first floor side extension would be set 0.2m from the boundary with No. 46 King George Road to the south. That property has a single storey garage set approximately 0.2m form the boundary also, though the main property is set approximately 3.2m from the boundary. Given the orientation of the two properties there would be no overshadowing to No. 46. The proposed extension would not project beyond the front or rear elevations of the host property, or of No. 46 and so it is not considered that there would be any overbearing impact or loss of outlook to that property. there would be no windows in the southern elevation of the extension and so there would be no significant loss of privacy to No. 46.

The garage would be reduced in size internally, with part of the existing garage being used as a utility and toilet. Therefore, it would no longer be possible to park a car in the garage. However, a driveway length of approximately 5.9m would remain and so there would be adequate in curtilage car parking space.

In conclusion, the proposed development would result in no significant harm to the residential amenity of any nearby properties, or to the visual amenity of the area. The proposed development would comply with all relevant local and national planning policies and therefore the application is 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

Dwg No. 300-1 Rev 5 received 28/01/2022
Dwg No. 300-2 Rev 6 received 28/01/2022

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

Case officer: Seán Gallagher
Signed:
Date: 09/02/2022

Authorised Signatory:
Date:

«END»