DELEGATED REPORT / CASE OFFICER'S ASSESSMENT

Ref No: ST/0804/22/HFUL
Proposal: Demolish existing single storey rear conservatory. Construct new first floor side extension over existing garage/sun lounge (en-suite bedroom extension). Construct new single storey kitchen/family/dining room extension to rear with associated alterations to door/window arrangements of roof, with 3no. roof lights. Change existing hipped roof to porch/garage to 'lean to' roof.
Location: 55 Summerhill Road
South Shields
NE34 6RZ

Site Visit Made: 08/11/2022

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 two storey north facing semi detached property in South Shields. The property has a conservatory to the rear which adjoins the eastern boundary. There is also a single storey wrap around front, side and rear extension which adjoins the western elevation of the conservatory.

This application seeks full planning permission to construct a first floor side extension over the existing single storey side extension. The existing conservatory would be demolished and a rear extension would be constructed in its place. The roof of the existing front extension would be changed from hipped to pitched.

Publicity / Consultations (Expiry date: 03/11/2022)

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.

LDF Policy DM1 seeks to preserve residential and visual amenity.

SPD9 provides guidance on householder developments.

First Floor Side Extension

Paragraph 12 of the NPPF states that where a planning application conflicts with an up-to-date development plan (including any neighbourhood plans that form part of the development plan),

permission should not usually be granted. Local planning authorities may take decisions that depart from an up-to-date development plan, but only if material considerations in a particular case indicate that the plan should not be followed.

Paragraph 126 of the NPPF states that the creation of high quality buildings and places is fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve. Good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, creates better places in which to live and work and helps make development acceptable to communities.

Paragraph 130 of the NPPF states that Planning policies and decisions should ensure that developments:

a) will function well and add to the overall quality of the area, not just for the short term but over the lifetime of the development;
b) are visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and appropriate and effective landscaping;
c) are sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting, while not preventing or discouraging appropriate innovation or change (such as increased densities);
d) establish or maintain a strong sense of place, using the arrangement of streets, spaces, building types and materials to create attractive, welcoming and distinctive places to live, work and visit;
e) optimise the potential of the site to accommodate and sustain an appropriate amount and mix of development (including green and other public space) and support local facilities and transport networks; and
f) create places that are safe, inclusive and accessible and which promote health and well-being, with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users; and where crime and disorder, and the fear of crime, do not undermine the quality of life or community cohesion and resilience.

Paragraph 132 of the NPPF states that design quality should be considered throughout the evolution and assessment of individual proposals.

Paragraph 134 of the NPPF states that development that is not well designed should be refused, especially where it fails to reflect local design policies and government guidance on design, taking into account any local design guidance and supplementary planning documents such as design guides and codes.

LDF Policy DM1 “Management of Development” states that 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 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;

Supplementary Planning Document 9 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.

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 application site is located on a corner plot with its western side gable elevation forming part of the established building line which runs north/south on the eastern side of Summerhill Road. This building line is formed by the side elevations of properties that face north/south and also by the front elevations of properties facing to the west. The proposed first floor extension would protrude 3.65m beyond this established building line, which would be contrary to the guidance as set out in SPD9, and due to its location would be highly prominent in the vicinity. This would result in a prominent and discordant feature within the streetscene which would puncture beyond an established building line. Accordingly, there would be significant harm to the visual amenity of the area. There is already a single storey side extension at the application property that projects to a similar extent but that is much smaller in scale than the proposed side extension and is partially screened from view by an existing hedgerow to the property boundary.

SPD9 states that 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. The proposed first floor extension would have a hipped roof, whereas the host property has a pitched roof. The surrounding properties in the area are predominantly pitched roof also. It is considered that the hipped roof of the proposed first floor extension would be at odds with the pitched roof design of the host property and would result in significant harm to the visual amenity of the area.

Having regard for the above, it is considered that the proposed first floor side extension would not appear as a subordinate addition to the existing pair of semi-detached properties, and would not complement the scale and proportions of the original property. The difference in roof shape would unbalance the pair of semi detached properties. 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 semidetached properties, and the street scene as a whole.

The case officer has advised the applicant of these concerns however they have stated that they do not wish to amend the proposed scheme. The applicant's agent has highlighted some other examples of two storey side extensions in South Shields and sets out that they believe that this development should be permitted, on the basis that the highlighted examples have previously gained planning consent. However, having regard to the examples as highlighted by the applicant's agent, it is considered that each had different site specific circumstances at the time of decision and in addition they are all located some distance from the application site. Each site must be considered on its own merits and it is considered that in this case, for the reasons outlined above, the proposed development would not convey a sensitive consideration of its surroundings and as such would result in significant harm to the character and appearance of the area, which would be contrary to the NPPF, LDF Policy DM1, and the guidance contained within Supplementary Planning Document 9.

Rear Extension

In relation to rear extensions, SPD9 states that single storey rear extensions that would extend beyond the rear wall of the original dwelling house by up to 3 metres in respect of semi-detached or terraced houses will generally be acceptable.

The proposed rear extension would replace the existing conservatory and would project 2.3m from the main rear elevation of the host property adjacent to the boundary with No. 53 Summerhill Road, the attached property. this projection would be the same as the existing conservatory. The roof of the extension would be 0.2m higher than the existing conservatory. It is not considered that this would result in any significant further harm to the residential amenity of No. 53, particularly in terms of loss of outlook, overdominance and overshadowing. There would be no windows in the side elevation of the rear extension facing towards No. 53 and so there would be no significant loss of privacy to No. 53.

The design of the rear extension would be acceptable. It would not result in significant harm to the visual amenity of the area.

Alteration to Front Extension Roof

In relation to front extensions, SPD9 states that 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.

It is not considered that the changing of the front extension's roof from hipped to pitched would result in significant harm to the residential amenity of any neighbouring properties, or the visual amenity of the

area, given that it would be only marginally larger adjacent to the side boundary and no larger elsewhere than the existing roof and given the prevalence of other hipped roof front extensions in the area.

Overall it is considered that the proposal would result in significant harm to the visual amenity of the area, be not in accordance with Local Development Framework (LDF) Policy DM1 and the objectives of Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) 9 'Householder Developments', and so is not an acceptable form of development. The application is recommended for refusal.

Recommendation

Refuse Permission.

Refusal Reasons

1 The proposed first floor side extension by virtue of its substantial projection beyond the established building line on the eastern side of Summerhill Road, its scale and its hipped roof design would appear as an incongruous, overdominant and out of character feature in the streetscene and in relation to the pair of semi-detached dwellings of which it forms part resulting in significant harm to the visual amenities of the locality. This would be contrary to Policy DM1(A) of the South Tyneside Local Development Framework, the Council's Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) No.9 – Householder Developments and the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

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: 14/11/2022

Authorised Signatory: G.Horsman
Date: 15/11/2022

«END»