DELEGATED REPORT / CASE OFFICER'S ASSESSMENT

Ref No: ST/0222/22/HFUL
Proposal: Demolish part of existing garage and build 2 storey side extension and ground floor rear extension
Location: 198 Mortimer Road
South Shields
NE34 0RP

Site Visit Made: 12/04/2022

Relevant policies/SPDs

1 DM1 - Management of Development (A, B and G)

2 SPD9 - Householder Developments

Description of the site and of the proposals

The application property is a northeast facing, two storey semi-detached dwelling situated adjacent to similar dwellings. The dwelling has a hipped roof and has a large front garden. The rear garden is bounded by high boundary treatments with detached garage to the side/rear of the main dwelling. The driveway for the property is immediately adjacent to the neighbour driveway which also leads to their garage, however use of the garage for the parking of a vehicle has been removed by the erection of a side porch extension to the neighbour (no. 200 Mortimer Road).

Planning permission is sought for a two storey side extension and single storey rear extension. The proposed two storey extension would have a hipped roof, 2.2m in width with a lowered ridgeline. The extension would fall flush with the rear wall of the host property. The proposed single storey extension would project 3.5m from the rear elevation of the dwelling and would have a lean too roof. The proposals would be constructed of matching materials to the host dwelling. The dimensions of the proposal can be scaled off the pans submitted.

Publicity / Consultations (Expiry date 29/04/2022)

1) **Neighbour responses-** 1 representation received:

- 200 Mortimer Road – we are objecting to the side extension that is proposed, not the rear extension. Concerned that it could affect our access to our garage and rear of our property. the neighbours will have to keep their bins at the front which is unsightly. Will there be any windows on that extension which then overlook our property? It will be an imposing addition that could block light from our property and affect the value of our property.

Officer Comment- the extension is proposed to be built up to the boundary of the site and not over the neighbour's land access to the neighbours garage would still be achievable on their property. The storage of bins at the front of a property is not a material planning consideration. The loss of property value is not a material planning consideration. The design of the extension and its impact on neighbouring properties (including any windows within the proposed elevations) is considered later in this report.

2) Other Consultee responses- no representations received

Assessment

Visual amenity

Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) 9: Householder Developments states that two-storey and first floor side extensions can create a terracing effect within the street scene and give rise to inappropriate design. Therefore proposals must have regard to the general principles set out in Section 3 of SPD 9. The guidance further states 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.

SPD also states that in circumstance where a 1 metre gap cannot be retained the extension should not occupy more than two- thirds of the depth of the dwelling and should be located towards the rear of the main dwelling.

In this case no gap has been retained between the two-storey extension and the common boundary, but the extension would be set back 3m from the front elevation of the property. A third depth set back would equate to approximately 2.8m, and as such in this case the proposed set back would be above the third set back set out in SPD9. Given that the proposed set back would be over and above the guidance set out in SPD9, it is considered that an extension up to the common boundary would be acceptable in this case. It is also proposed for the extension to have a significantly lowered ridgeline compared to the main dwelling. The set back together with the lowered ridgeline and hipped roof would ensure the two-storey side extension remains subordinate to the main dwelling and would be in keeping with the main dwelling and the surrounding street scene.

The single storey extension is situated to the rear of the application site and would not be visible from the main street scene. The proposal as a whole would not have an adverse impact on the built form of the original dwelling or the visual amenity of the surrounding area. A condition is suggested to ensure the facing materials match the original dwelling. Subject to the aforementioned condition it is considered that the proposal would comply with LDF Policy DM1 (A) and guidance set out in SPD9.

Residential amenity

Two Storey Extension

The proposed two storey extension would be built flush with the rear elevation of the dwelling and therefore this element of the works would not impact the attached neighbour at No 196 Mortimer Road. The only neighbour likely to be affected by this element of the proposal would be No 200 Mortimer Road, the adjacent dwelling to the southeast of the application site. The proposed two storey extension would not breach the two-storey building line of Mortimer Road and would therefore not project past the neighbour at No 200 Mortimer Road, having no impact on the habitable room windows in the rear of this dwelling. The northeast elevation of No 200 Mortimer Road has window facing the applicant property and a glazed entrance porch set 0.7m of the boundary with the application site. The window in the gable of No 200 Mortimer Road is obscure glazed and appears to serve a non-habitable room. The proposed two storey extension, due to its subservient design and location on the dwelling would cause very little additional overshadowing to the side elevation of No 200 Mortimer Road over and above the existing levels of overshadowing caused by the host dwelling to warrant a reason of refusal. Additionally, as per the guidance set out in SPD9, the porch is a non-habitable room and therefore any impact on this part of the property is given limited weight in the assessment of this application.

Given the existing site circumstances, it is not considered that the proposal would have a harmful impact on the neighbour at No 200 Mortimer Road with regards to outlook and overdominance, loss of privacy or overshowing and loss of daylight. The proposed two storey extension is therefore considered to be in accordance with Policy DM1 (B) and SPD9.

Single storey extension

The single storey extension would project 3.5m from the rear elevation of the host dwelling. The adjoining property has an extension on the common boundary with the application site which projects approximately 3.2m. the neighbour at No 196 Mortimer Road has no windows facing the application site and due to the presence of the extension at No 196, the proposed extension in this application would not be harmful to this neighbour with regards to outlook and overdominance, loss of privacy or loss of daylight to the rear habitable room windows. The single storey extension would be built up to the boundary with No 200 Mortimer Road. However, extension would be located 2m away from the neighbouring property itself. No 200 Mortimer Road also has a detached garage, brick store and 1.8m high boundary wall along the boundary with the application site. The garage, store and boundary treatment would obscure the majority of the proposed single storey extension from the habitable room windows on the ground floor of No 200 Mortimer Road. Given the site circumstances, the proposed single storey extension would be limited impact on No 200 Mortimer Road with regards to outlook and overdominance, loss of privacy or overshadowing. The proposed single storey extension would not be harmful to neighbouring properties with regards to neighbour amenity and therefore complies with Policy DM1 (A) and SPD9.

Highway implications

Though the extension would reduce the length of the properties drive, a driveway of 9m on length would be retained at the front of the property. It is therefore considered that the proposal would be acceptable with regards to off-street parking and highways safety .

Summary

The proposal accords with Local Development Framework policy DM1 and due regard has been given to Supplementary Planning Document 9; Householder Developments.

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

Existing and Proposed Floor Plans Drg No 1 received 16/03/2022

Existing and Proposed Elevations Drg No 2 received 16/03/2022

Existing and Proposed Site Layout Plans Drg No 3 received 16/03/2022

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

3 UNIQUE NOTE TO APPLICANT

Your attention is drawn to the Party Wall Etc. Act 1996, which provides a framework for preventing and resolving disputes in relation to party walls, boundary walls and excavations near neighbouring buildings.

A building owner proposing to start work covered by the Act must give adjoining owners notice of their intentions in the way set down in the Act. Adjoining owners can agree or disagree with what is proposed. Where they disagree, the Act provides a mechanism for resolving disputes.

The Act is separate from obtaining planning permission or building regulations approval and you can find out more about it at: https://www.gov.uk/party-wall-etc-act-1996-guidance

Case officer: Samantha Gallagher
Signed: S Gallagher
Date: 03/05/2022

Authorised Signatory:
Date: