DELEGATED REPORT / CASE OFFICER'S ASSESSMENT

Ref No: ST/0734/23/HFUL
Proposal: 2 storey side extension - hall, cupboard, utility, diningroom, bedroom and bathroom
Location: 164 Ashgrove Avenue
South Shields
NE34 8BA

Site Visit Made: 14/11/2023

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 south facing, two storey semi-detached dwelling situated adjacent to similar dwellings to the east and south. To the north and west is a relatively modern housing state with a mix of semi-detached, terraced and detached dwellings. The applicant property occupies a corner plot with its attached neighbour to the east and a parking area to the west. The rear garden is bounded by high boundary fences except for the western boundary, which includes access gates (from the adjacent parking area) to serve the detached outbuilding / garage adjacent to the rear boundary.

Planning permission is sought for a two-storey side extension on the western elevation of the dwelling. The proposed extension would have a hipped roof, would be 4m in width an include a lowered ridgeline. The extension would be set back from the front elevation of the original dwelling. The proposals would be constructed of matching material to the host dwelling.

Publicity / Consultations (Expiry date 22/11/2023)

1) **Neighbour responses-** no representations received

2) **Other Consultee responses-** no representations received

Assessment

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.

Visual amenity

Policy DM1 (A) requires development to be acceptable in relation to impact on the visual amenity of the property and the street scene.

Given the nature of the proposal, the front and side extension elements would be visible from the public domain. The proposed materials including the brickwork, roof tiles, and uPVC windows would match those on the existing dwelling. It is considered that the whole proposal would convey sensitive

consideration to its surroundings having regard to its scale, proportion and use of materials and is acceptable in terms of its design and also local visual amenity.

The proposed extension would have a matching roof form to the main dwelling and would have the ridge set down from the main ridgeline of the property. The extension would also be set back from the front elevation of the original dwelling. This would be in accordance with the guidance set out in SPD9 which seeks householder development to be subservient to the main dwelling. The proposed extension would have a width of 4m which would be more than half the width of the original dwelling. Although this is contrary to SPD9, the proposed extension would not undermine the character or the street scene of or the existing property as it would remain a subservient addition to the main dwelling. Given the application site occupies a corner plot, it is also considered that a terracing effect would not occur in this instance. Having regard to the lowered ridgeline, the front elevation set back and the location of the site on a corner plot, it Is judged that the 4m width would not be excessively wide and would appear as a subordinate addition to the dwelling and would not create a terracing effect within the street scene.

The applicant property is on a corner plot, paragraph 7.6m of SPD9 states that to preserve the character of the street scene, two storey side extensions on corner plots should not extend beyond the established building line of the return side street frontage and if no clear building line easily identifiable, such extensions should seek to retain a minimum side space of 2m from the plot boundary. In this case, the layout of the street is unusual in that there is no return side street frontage. However, the proposal would retain a gap of 2.1m between the proposed extension and the boundary of the application site. The proposal would therefore not harm the character of the street scene.

Given all of the above, it is considered that the proposal 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

Policy DM1 (B) requires a development to be acceptable in relation to any impact on residential amenity.

The attached semi-detached neighbour is located to the east of the application site. The proposal would not breach the building line of the front or rear elevations of the property and would therefore have no impact upon this neighbour.

The neighbour to the west (18 The Ridgeway) is separated by an access road between it and the application site. The proposed extension would project past the rear elevation of this neighbour by approximately 0.2m and this neighbour has no habitable room windows facing the application site. Given this, it is considered that the proposal would not cause a loss of privacy or outlook or cause increased overdominance or overshadowing to this neighbour. As such, it is considered that the proposal would not be harmful to the residential amenity of this neighbour.

The neighbours to the rear of the application site are located 18m from the rear elevation of the host dwelling. the proposed extension would host two habitable room windows within the rear elevation. Views from the ground floor window of the extension would be interrupted by the 1.8m high fence along the rear boundary and would prevent direct views between habitable rooms of the proposed extension and the neighbours to the rear. The proposed window to the first floor would serve a bedroom and would be separated from the bedroom windows or the properties to the rear by 18m. This is considered sufficient distance to prevent overlooking and loss of privacy or overdominance to these neighbours. Given the separation distance and the orientation of the dwellings, it is considered that the proposal would not be harmful to these properties in terms of significant levels of overshadowing.

Any other neighbours to the front (south) are located at a significant enough distance to not be affected by the proposal and as such no amenity or privacy concerns would occur to these properties.

With regard to all of the above, the impact of the proposed development on neighbouring amenity of considered to be acceptable. Therefore, the proposed development is considered to be in accordance with Policy DM1 (B), while having regard to the principles set out in SPD9.

Highway implications

The extension would not impact on the existing driveway of the property with a driveway of 5.9m and a garage being retained. It is therefore considered that the proposal would be acceptable with regards to off-street parking and highways safety. It is considered that the development would cause harm to highways safety and therefore accord with Policy DM1 (G) and SPD9.

Summary

It is considered that the development would be in accordance with LDF Policy DM1 (A, B and G), the associated Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) 9 'Householder Developments', and the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework.

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 Plans Drg No.0746-9843-076 111023

Proposed Front Elevation and Proposed First Floor Plan Drg No.536-7519 111023

Proposed Rear Plan Drg No.1 111023

Proposed Site and Roof Plan 111023

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.

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 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: Samantha Gallagher
Signed: S Gallagher
Date: 23/11/2023

Authorised Signatory: Helen Lynch
Date: 23/11/2023

«END»