DELEGATED REPORT / CASE OFFICER'S ASSESSMENT

Ref No: ST/0851/23/HFUL
Proposal: Two storey extension to front and rear of house. Removal of existing conservatory to rear and construction of single storey rear extension. Conversion of integral garage to habitable room. Changes to external openings and finishes.

Location: 2 Glenhurst Grove
South Shields
NE34 6AJ

Site Visit Made: 14/02/2024 and 15/02/2024

Relevant policies/SPDs

Local Development Framework

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

2 DM7 - Biodiversity and Geodiversity Sites

3 EA3 - Biodiversity and Geodiversity

4 SPD9 - Householder Developments

Emerging Local Plan

4 LP Policy 36 - Protecting Trees, Woodland and Hedgerows

5 LP Policy 47 - Design Principles

Description of the site and of the proposals

The application property is a detached dwelling located at Glenhurst Grove on a small cul-de-sac of other detached/semi-detached dwellings of various styles and sizes. The neighbours to the east and the north are of a similar design to the application site. To the west /southwest are properties located within North Avenue which consist of detached two storey dwellings. To the southeast is a detached bungalow with another detached property beyond this. The property benefits from a large rear garden and large front garden with off-street parking.

The proposal seeks permission to erect a two storey and single storey rear extension following the removal of the conservatory on the rear elevation of the building. The two-storey extension would be the full width of the property and would project 3.2m from the rear elevation of the property. The two-storey extension would have two pitched roof features with a flat roof link. Beyond the two-storey extension element, a single storey rear extension would further extend 3.1m and would have a flat roof. The materials would be matching brickwork, render and roof tiles to match the existing property, with upvc windows and powder coated aluminium doors.

The proposal also seeks permission to erect a two-storey pitched roof front extension in the centre of the property, protruding approximately 2.2m forward of the principal elevation. The front elevation would also be altered to remove the balcony feature on the front of the dwelling and replace it with windows. The front extension would be constructed of brickwork and matching roof tiles, with the front elevations covered in render.

The exiting garage of the property would be converted to a habitable room with the garage door removed and its replacement with windows.

The application has been amended to correct an error within the description of the application. The single storey element was added to the description and neighbours were re-notified for 14 days in line with the Councils Statement of Community involvement. The agent has also provided additional information to assist the case officer's assessment of the application. This information relates to a sun path analysis to assist the assessment of overshowing impacts and an additional plan show the 45-degree splays from the neighbour's habitable room window to assist the assessment of overdominance and potential loss of outlook.

Publicity / Consultations (Expiry date 28/03/2024)

1) Neighbour responses – 10 objections received (summarised below):

1 Glenhurst Grove (x4) – (x2 representations received From Nimble Planning on behalf of the residents of No. 1)

The existing dwelling is a simple, detached dwelling with a gable roof. It is characterful due to its front balcony with metal detailing, and its materiality, which matches that of nearby dwellings.

- The two-storey front element would make significant alterations to the fenestration and materiality at the principal elevation - with large areas of glazing and sections of render.
- The two-storey front extension would be overly dominating on the original part of the building by its design, alongside the alteration to the fenestration and proposed materials which would visually overwhelm and detract from the original form and detailing of the house. This would be harmful to the character of the dwelling and the surrounding street scene.
- These impacts would be exacerbated by rear extensions. The proposal would result in a significant footprint and volume increase to the dwelling which would result in significant extra bulk and massing which would fail to be subservient to its host.
- The additions as a whole are considered overly dominant which would consume the entire building and appear as overdevelopment of the plot, resulting in significant negative impacts on the visual amenity of the host dwelling and the surrounding area.
- The proposed rear elements are in close proximity to the sites eastern boundary which is shared with No. 1 and the western elevation of No.1's sunroom, which contains windows providing light to this habitable space. The two-storey element would extend around 3.18m from the rear of the dwelling, whilst the ground floor element would extend 6.3m from the rear.
- The proposal would result in a two-storey blank brick wall directly next to this sunroom wall which would result in a significant loss of outlook, loss of light and an overbearing impact on users of this room.
- It is noted that the planning officer visited the property and stated that the residential amenity impacts of extension is not taken into account. This is not considered correct, and the residential amenity should be judged based on the current situation.
- Furthermore, the prosed single storey element would extend significantly past the rear of the dwelling and the rearmost elevation of No.1's sunroom. It is considered that due to the height of the proposal and its proximity to the sites boundary, there would be overbearing impacts, loss of light and loss of outlook impacts to No. 1 and an eclosing and overbearing impact on garden users, which would result in an unacceptable impact on residential amenity of the occupiers of No.1.
- As outlined previously, it is considered that the proposed development would result in significant negative residential amenity impacts on neighbouring occupiers.
- Residents at no. 1 have been told by the case officer that impacts on their extension cannot be taken into account, this is not generally the approach taken by Local Planning Authorities and cannot be seen to be the correct approach. Even if the extension if the extension where

not there, the proposal would result in significant negative impacts on the rear garden area of No. 1 by way of overshadowing, loss of light, loss of outlook and overbearing impacts.
- The submission includes a rear window plan and a map showing sun path. This shows the extreme degree of overshowing the proposal would have on the side windows of the rear extension. It is not considered that these plans show the residential amenity impact of the proposal would be acceptable, rather, they show that the concerns of the residents of No. 1 are legitimate.

Case Officer note – the impact of the extension on No. 1 Glenhurst Grove is detailed later in this report. The case officer has visited No. 1 to assess the impact of the proposal on this dwelling.

3 Glenhurst Grove (x1)

- Object to the overdevelopment of No. 2 and the visual impact it will have on our property and neighbouring properties. The large two storey extension and glazing is a significant change and dominates the front of the house bringing it much closer to No. 3. It will overlook plot 3 causing further overshadowing and a lack of privacy.
- Concerned about the trees on plot 2 which are TPO'd and the suggestion made in the planning application that these trees should be coppiced. This is not unfound as the owner on No. 2, ignoring restrictive covenants to 'preserve and safeguard trees and shrubs', has already removed a 35m long hedge/ this hedgerow of outstanding beauty, the habitat for many species has been replaced by a fence, it has changed the unique character of the cul-de-sac.

Case Officer note – the impact of the development in No. 3 is considered later in this report. The planning system cannot control the removal of domestic boundary hedges and cannot be involved in private civil matters, such as restrictive covenant. No works are proposed to the protected trees within this application and separate consent would need to be obtained for this.

7 Glenhurst Grove (x1)

- Th development is far too big and close to No. 1 taking away their light.
- The removal of trees, all of them mature will have a detrimental effect on the character of the area and wildlife.
- Glenhurst Grove is a narrow lane with only a small turning area. There is no space of builders vehicles to park.
- The entire overdevelopment impacts badly on the historical conservation area.
- This will have a distressing effect on No. 1 but the character of the whole area.

Case Officer note – a full assessment of the impacts of the proposal on the nearby residents and the surrounding area is considered later in this report. No trees are proposed to be removed as part of this application. The properties are not located within the conservation area.

16 North Avenue (x2)

- This proposed development will have a negative impact and encroach on my privacy and enjoyment of rear garden and garden room.
- The amendments only relate to the description, the plan is the same, so my objection is also the same.

16 a North Avenue (x2)

- The rear of my house looks directly at the western elevation of the property. The proposed two storey extension will significantly impinge on the outlook from the kitchen/dining room which is less than 14m from the western elevation of the property, my property sits 1m below

the ground level of the application site which will add to the domineering effect the extension will have.

- The drawings appear to indicate that the two-storey extension would increase the west elevation by around 50%. Regardless of the potential increase in size, a two-storey rear extension directly impacts my outlook at a neighbour.
- The two-storey extension will have a domineering impact upon my outdoor seating area located adjacent to the existing conservatory building and where the proposed extension is planned. The application makes no reference to the single storey extension for the rear.
- As an alternative solution, the other could consider a single storey rear extension to the property that doesn't impact on my outlook.
- Second repression confirmed that their objection is the same.

2) Other Consultee responses

Tree Team -

On the subject application, I am generally comfortable with the proposal provided that the tree protection measures set out in the Arboricultural method statement and TPP are carried out in full. I would be happy to support the application with the standard condition for compliance with the Arboricultural reports and plan.

I would mention the tree survey recommends some works for arboricultural reasons which are not necessary to implement the planning permission. The application, if granted, would not give permission for the works to T7 ash which is protected by a TPO, the applicant would have to make a separate TPO application should they wish to carry out these works.

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 statutory development plan comprises the Council's adopted Local Development Framework (LDF) development plan documents. Adopted supplementary planning documents are also capable of being material considerations in planning decisions. A Regulation 19 version of the South Tyneside Local Plan was recently subject to consultation from 15/01/2024 to 03/03/2024 and this marked the second of two statutory consultation periods in the plan-marking process. While the draft Local Plan is now at a more advanced stage of preparation, with the Regulation 19 consultation completed, the extent to which there are unresolved objections to particular policies is currently being assessed and therefore only very limited weight can be afforded to policies in the emerging local plan at the current time having regard to paragraph 48 of the NPPF. As such, any relevant emerging local plan policies that were listed earlier in this report are not appraised in detail in the assessment set out below***.***

In assessing this application, due regard has been had to the requirement of Section 149 of the Equality Act 2010. The main issues relevant to the determination of this application are the:

- Design of the proposal and its impact on visual amenity;
- Impact on residential amenity; and
- Highways and parking.
- Impact on trees

Design / Visual Amenity and Impact on Surrounding Area

Given the nature of the proposal, parts of the development would be visible from the public domain. Concerns have been raised by neighbouring properties regarding the impact of the proposal on the design and character of the property, the surrounding area and a concern about overdevelopment of the plot. Particular concerns have been raised regarding the extension and alterations to the front elevation and their impact on the surrounding area and the impact of the additional massing of the proposal as a result of the extensions.

It should be noted that Glenhurst Grove is a cul-de-sac containing self-built dwellings, and as such the character of the area is not uniform, with properties differing in terms of styles, materials and architectural detailing. There are elements of render, brickwork and cladding. A number of properties have also been subject to historic extensions, including No's 1, 3, 4, 5 and 6 Glenhurst Grove.

SPD9 states that two storey front extensions are only permitted where it can be demonstrated they would not result in any detrimental impact in respect of the key principles relating to visual impact, neighbouring amenity, highway safety and trees. The latter three points will be considered further below, however in respect of the visual amenity of the proposal, the property is a detached dwelling, and the two-storey front element would be centred and set down over a metre from the overall ridge height of the dwelling. SPD9 sets out that the extent of front extensions on detached properties with large front gardens will be determined by the available space and upon the character of the existing property, having regard to the general principles set out in Section 3 of SPD9. The projection at 2.3m would retain a significant distance between the property and the public realm. The front extension would have a matching eaves height to the main dwelling and would have a significantly dropped ridgeline from the ridgeline of the main dwelling. The extension would also be significantly set in from the side elevations of the property, ensuring a subservient appearance in terms of massing and proportions. The front extension would be constructed of brick to match the existing dwelling with large elements of glazing. Neighbours have raised concerns about the large elements of glazing in the front elevation of the proposed extension. During the case officers site visit, it was noted that No. 1 Glenhurst Grove, the immediate neighbour to the application site, benefits from a front extension that also houses significant elements of glazing. Given this context it is not considered that the proposal would introduce a unique feature and would not result in harm to the visual amenity of the properties or the surrounding area. Overall, it is not considered that the proposed front extension would be a disproportionate addition to the dwelling. The neighbouring property at No. 1 Glenhurst Grove benefits from a front extension and the various designs of the properties on Glenhurst Grove means that the street has no consistent character. It is therefore considered that the proposed front extension would not be harmful to the surrounding street scene which is characterised by dwellings of individual designs.

Neighbours have also raised concerns regarding the alterations to the front elevation of the dwelling which would remove the first-floor balcony and metal railings, and existing garage. These alterations are not considered harmful to the visual amenity of the property or the surrounding area. As set out above, No. 1 Glenhurst Grove benefits from alterations to the front elevation. Whilst the concerns of neighbours are noted, the property itself is a relatively modern property with no distinct architectural features and as previously referenced, the street lacks any consistent design or character. The alterations to the front elevation are considered well balanced with the proposed new windows replicating the size and proportions of existing windows within the front elevation of the building. The materials palette for the front elevation would replicate and use materials similar to those of the existing dwelling and surrounding properties.

In terms of the rear extension, as a whole this would protrude a maximum of 6.3m (3.2m for the two-storey extension and 3.1 for the single storey extension) and would be across the full width of the property. SPD9 sets out that single storey rear extension 4m in projection and 3m two storey extensions will generally be acceptable, anything over these distances will be considered on a case-by-case basis having due regard to site specific circumstances and any permitted development fallback position available to the property. With regards to the two-storey extension, this would run across the full width of the property and would have a two pitched roof features connected by a flat roof link. The single storey extension would have a flat roof and would project 3.1m beyond the two-storey extension.

The proposed two storey extension would have a matching eaves height to the main dwelling and a significantly dropped ridgeline compared to the main dwelling. The extension would be constructed of brickwork and roof materials to match the main dwelling, aside from the flat roof area and the powder coated aluminium doors. The two-storey extension at 3.2m in projection would be 0.2m over the projection of a permitted development two storey extension. The extension would be set in from the side boundary with No. 1 Glenhurst Grove by 1.2m and from the side boundary with the properties on North Avenue by 1.3m, therefore the extension would be closer to the side boundaries than a permitted development extension. However, a significant amount of the two-storey extension could be constructed under these permitted development rights, and it is not considered that the additional projection or the additional massing adjacent to the side boundaries of the application site would be so over and above a permitted development extension to warrant a refusal on design grounds. The additional massing would be located to the rear of the property and would be mostly obscured from the public realm.

The proposed single storey extension would project 3.1m beyond the proposed two-storey rear extension and would have a flat roof with a total height of 3.5m and would be constructed of brickwork to match the main dwelling. As with the two-storey extension, the proposal would be mostly obscured from the public realm around the site and would therefore have limited impact in terms of visual amenity of the property or the surrounding area.

Concerns have also been raised regarding the overdevelopment of the property and the increase in massing. Whilst the extensions are significant in projection and massing, the properties on Glenhurst Grove, and surrounding streets are mostly large, detached dwellings within substantial plots. The property would retain a substantial front and rear garden. It is therefore considered that the proposal would not be an overdevelopment of the plot, nor would the increased size of the dwelling be out of keeping with the surrounding area.

Overall, it is considered that the proposal would not be harmful to the visual amenity of the property or the surrounding area. Subject to a condition relating to the materials being as per those detailed on the application forms and proposed plans, it is considered that the development would accord with LDF Policy DM1 (A) and the guidance contained within SPD9.

Impact on residential amenity

The proposal would not harm the amenities of the neighbours to the north/northwest given the levels of separation between them and the application site. The neighbours most likely to be affected by the proposals are No.'s 1 and 3 Glenhurst Grove and 16, 16A, 8 and 8A North Avenue. SPD9 sets out guidance for householder development within the borough, including the considerations then Local Planning Authority will have towards householder developments.

No. 1 Glenhurst Grove is located immediately to the east of the application site and is the neighbour mostly likely to be affected by the proposals. The proposed front extension would be significantly set in from the boundary with No. 1 to prevent loss of amenity from the habitable rooms within the front elevation of No. 1. The main impact on No. 1 would arise from the two storey and single-storey rear extension. The building line between the application site and No. 1 is slightly staggered resulting in the rear elevation of No. 1 projecting further than the rear elevation of the application site. No. 1 also benefits from a single storey extension on the rear adjacent to the boundary with the application site which has high/mid-level windows facing the application site and a large picture window facing towards the south. The properties are separated by a 1.8m high timber boundary fence with each property set approximately 1.2m from the shared boundary – resulting in a gap of approximately 2m.

No. 1 Glenhurst Grove has raised concerns about the impact of the property's extensions on their rear extension and rear garden. Paragraph 6.2 of SPD9 is clear that the planning authority cannot protect the outlook that many have been created by placing a window on the common boundary. In this case, the extension at No.1 has created a situation that cannot be protected by the planning system regardless of

how long the extension has been in place. Whilst No.1 has referred to other Local Authorities not taking this approach, the application must be considered in relation to the Local Plan Policies and Guidance for the South Tyneside Area, alongside national policy. As such, very limited weight can be given to the impact of the proposed extension on the side facing windows within the extension at No.1 Glenhurst Grove. Notwithstanding this, the case officer visited No. 1 Glenhurst Grove to fully assess the impact of the proposals on this neighbour. As well as the side facing windows, the extension at No.1 also benefits from large picture window facing the south which is considered to form the main outlook of this part of the property with the side facing elevations being secondary windows to this room. The south facing window would not be impacted by the proposed extensions and therefore the main outlook from this room would be retained and unaltered. No. 1 Glenhurst Grove is located to the east of the application site and so there would be some overshadowing impacts during the later afternoon as a result of the proposed extension, as identified in the additional sun path analysis provided by the agent and undertaken by the case officer. As highlighted above, the side facing windows of No. 1 are considered secondary windows with the primary window being within the southeast elevations which would still allow adequate daylight and sunlight to this room at No.1. As such it is considered that the proposal would not result in a significant overshadowing or loss of outlook or increased overdominance to No 1. No windows are proposed in the side elevations of the extension to prevent loss of privacy to No. 1.

Additionally, weight must also be given to the permitted development fallback position already discussed in this report. A two-storey extension with a 3m projection from the rear wall, set in from the side boundaries by 2m and 7m from the rear boundary could be constructed on the applicant dwelling without planning permission. Whilst the proposed two storey extension subject to this application would not be permitted development, weight must be given to a two-storey permitted development extension and any additional harm caused by the current proposal should be considered for additional impact to the neighbouring properties. The two-storey element of the of the application would be only 0.2m in additional projection than a permitted development extension and would be only 0.8m closer than a permitted development extension. The proposed two -storey extension would therefore have a similar impact than that of a permitted development extension as a result of the staggered rear building line. It is therefore considered that the additional projection of the extension and its proximity to the boundary would not cause such additional harm to the neighbour at No. 1 compared to a permitted development extension to warrant the refusal of the application.

Whilst the proposed single storey extension could not be constructed under permitted development, this element of the application would be of similar height to the extension at No.1 and would project marginally past the extension at No. 1. However, the main outlook of No.1 – facing towards the south- would be retained. It is therefore considered that the proposal would not be harmful to the single storey projection on the rear of No. 1 Glenhurst Grove.

A further consideration is the impact of the extension on the first floor of No. 1 Glenhurst Grove. This neighbour has a bedroom window in the rear elevation within proximity of the boundary of the application. The case officer, in order to fully assess any resultant impact, contacted the applicant's agent who supplied a plan showing the 45-degree line from the centre of this bedroom window which shows that the two-storey extension would not breach this 45-degree line. This is also aided by the staggered building line between the properties resulting in the two-storey element only projecting 3m past the rear elevation of No. 1 Glenhurst Grove, and the 2m gap between the properties ensuring enough distance to prevent loss of outlook, overshowing or increased overdominance to the first-floor window at No 1. No windows are proposed in the side elevation of the extension to cause loss of privacy to No. 1.

No. 1 Glenhurst Grove raised concerns of overshowing impacts on their garden. The rear garden of No.1 is substantial in size and whilst some overshadowing of part of the garden would occur in the later hours of the day, this would not be to such a degree to be considered harmful. Additionally, as identified in SPD9 less weight can be given to garden space.

Overall, it is considered that the proposal would not be significantly harmful to the neighbour at No.1 Glenhurst Grove to be considered detrimental to this neighbour to warrant a reason of refusal on amenity grounds.

No. 3 Glenhurst Grove to the north-west of the application site would only be impacted by the proposed extension and alterations to the front elevation of the dwelling. No. 3 benefits from a single storey conservatory on the side elevation which is situated at an angle towards the application site. This conservatory would be located approximately 10m from the proposed two storey extension and 15m from the new windows in the front elevation of the applicant dwelling. The proposed two storey extension would host two windows which would serve a hallway and staircase and therefore not a habitable room. As such, this part of the proposal is not considered to reduce the privacy of No. 3 as a result of overlooking or direct habitable room - to -habitable room impacts. The new windows would serve habitable rooms on the ground and first floor however given the 15m separation distance it is considered that no loss of privacy would occur. Given the layout of the estate, it is not considered that the proposals would reduce outlook of No. 3 or cause significant overshadowing over and above the existing situation. Overall, it is considered that the proposal would not be harmful to the residential amenity of the occupiers of No 3 Glenhurst Grove.

The neighbour at No. 16a North Avenue is located to the west of the application site. The rear of No. 16a faces the western gable of the application site and benefits from a single storey extension. No. 16a is located approximately 12m (at ground floor) and 17m (at first floor) from the boundary with the application site. This neighbour raised particular concern regarding the impact of the proposals on the outlook from this property and the extension having a dominating impact upon an outdoor seating area within the properties garden. Given the level of separation between the application site and No. 16a, it is considered that this would be enough distance to prevent loss of outlook. Given the orientation of the dwellings, it is considered that the proposals would not give rise to significant levels of overshadowing of No. 16a. No windows are proposed in the side elevation of the extension facing this neighbour and therefore no loss of privacy would occur. Overall, it is considered that the proposal would not be harmful to the residential amenity of the occupiers of No. 16a North Avenue.

16 North Avenue is located over 22m from the application site and given this distance it is considered that the proposal would not be harmful to the residential amenity of this property with regards to loss of outlook or overdominance. Given the orientation of the dwellings it is not considered that the proposal would result in significant overshowing to this property. No windows are proposed facing this neighbour preventing loss of privacy.

The properties at 8 and 8A North Avenue are located to the southeast of the application and would be located over 20m from the proposed extensions. This is considered sufficient distance to prevent loss of amenity these residents with regards to loss of privacy or outlook or increased overshadowing or overdominance.

Given all of the above, the proposal is considered acceptable in relation to the consideration of the residential amenities of the surrounding neighbours and would be in accordance with LDF Policy DM1 (B).

Highways and parking

The proposal would result in the loss of the garage for vehicular parking. However, the 29m long driveway would be retained and provide sufficient space for the Parking of vehicles off the highway. It is therefore considered that the proposal would not be harmful to parking and highways safety and would in in accordance with LDF Policy DM1 (G).

Trees

There are eight trees within and adjacent (overhanging) the site. The application is supported by an arboricultural assessment due to protected trees within and overhanging the site. The application does not propose the removal of any trees within the application and recommends appropriate protective measures within the root protection area of one, adjacent third-party tree. The Councils Tree Team have been consulted on the application and have confirmed they are comfortable with the proposal provided that the tree protection measures set out in the arboricultural method statement and tree protection plan are carried out and that they would be happy to support the proposal subject to a condition to comply with the recommendation in the arboricultural reports. Subject to the inclusion of this condition it is not considered that the proposed development would have the potential to have any likely significant effect on the health or amenity value of these protected trees. The proposals are therefore considered to be in accordance with LDF Policies DM1 (C) and DM7.

Neighbours have raised concerns about the recommended works to a protected tree within the site. The tree team have confirmed that this planning application would not give permission for these works to take place and that these works would need to be applied for via an application for works to a protected tree should the applicant wish to carry out these works. An informative is recommended to inform the applicant of this.

Other matters

Neighbours have raised the matter of builder's vehicles and lack of parking on site. Whilst these concerns are noted, the property benefits from a large parking area which would be able to house builders' vehicles. Additionally, Glenhurst Grove is subject to double yellow lines, and therefore prohibits any parking.

Neighbours have referred to works to the site prior to the submission of this planning application which included the removal of a boundary hedge to the front of the dwelling. Whilst the loss of the boundary hedge is regrettable, the planning system has no control over domestic hedgerows, and this could be removed without permission from the Local Planning Authority.

The Countryside Team have confirmed that no bat survey work is required to support this application due to the property being separated from suitable habitat. They have however requested that informative relating to bats and nesting birds and biodiversity net gain be included on any consent granted.

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 Site Plans - DRAWING NO. AL-50 received 13/12/2023

Proposed Elevations - DRAWING NO AL-40 received 13/12/2023

Proposed Floor Plans- DRAWING NO. AL-20 received 13/12/2023

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 as per the application form (received 13/12/2023 and the Proposed Elevations - DRAWING NO AL-40 (received 13/12/2023).

To ensure a satisfactory standard of development and in the interests of visual amenity in accordance with South Tyneside LDF Development Management Policy DM1.

4 The development hereby approved shall be undertaken in accordance with the mitigation measures as set out in Section 6 'Pre-Development BS5837 Arboricultural Implications Assessment' (received 25/01/2024) and Tree Protection Plan Drawing number: TPP.2 Glenhurst.GRV.NO1 (received 25/01/2024).

To ensure a satisfactory standard of development in the interests of arboricultural management and biodiversity in accordance with Core Strategy Policy EA3 and Development Management Policies DM1 and DM7 of the South Tyneside Local Development Framework.

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

2 All British bats are protected by both UK and European legislation. This legal protection extends to any place that a bat uses for shelter or protection whether bats are present or not. Should bats or signs of bats (such as droppings or dead bats) be discovered at any stage during the works, work must stop immediately and advice sought from Natural England. Failure to do this may result in an offence being committed, regardless of planning consent, and could lead to prosecution. Natural England Bat Advice Line: 0345 1300 228

3 NOTE TO APPLICANT

Under UK legislation it is an offence to intentionally or recklessly disturb, damage or destroy an active birds nest. An active nest is one which is in the process of being built or contains eggs / chicks. Activities which may affect nesting birds must be organised and timed to avoid the bird breeding season which is March to August inclusive. Failure to do so may result in an offence being committed, regardless of planning consent, and could lead to prosecution under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981.

4 NOTE TO APPLICANT

The NPPF states that planning decisions should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by minimising impact on and providing net gains for biodiversity.

The applicant should include a feature in the build itself such as:

An integrated Swift Brick, an example can be found here https://www.nhbs.com/manthorpe-swift-brick
o Although they are called Swift Bricks, these bricks are used buy several bird species.
o More information on these bricks can be found here: https://cieem.net/swift-bricks-the-universal-nest-brick-by-dick-newell/
o An externally fitted bird box on the building

o An integrated fitted bird box as per Table 4 of the submitted report

o An integrated bat box in the build itself.

An integrated bat box attached to the western aspect as recommended in the Bat Conservation Trust guidelines which can be found at: https://www.bats.org.uk/our-work/buildings-planning-and-development/bat-boxes

o Bee bricks integrated within the building.

5 NOTE TO APPLICANT

The grant of this planning permission does not give consent for works to T7 which is subject to a Tree Preservation Order. Should the applicant wish to carry out these works, a separate application for Works to a Protected Tree would need to be submitted to the Local Planning Authority.

Case officer: Samantha Gallagher
Signed: S Gallagher
Date: 04/04/2024

Authorised Signatory: Helen Lynch
Date: 04/04/2024

«END»