South Tyneside Council

Reference:	250412
Location:	24 Ambleside Avenue South Shields NE34 0DY
Ward:	West Park
Description:	Hip to Gable conversion; Flat roof dormer to rear elevation;
Recommendation:	Refuse Householder Permission
Case Officer:	Emma Thomas
Case Officer Contact No.:	0191 4247593 or 07741105284

Description of the Site

This application relates to a semi-detached dwelling located in a residential area of South Shields. The property has a hipped roof and there is a hipped roof two storey extension to the side elevation and also projecting to the rear. To the rear there is a single storey extension. There is a paved driveway to the front and a moderately sized garden to the rear.

The site is set within a residential area of South Shields which contains a number of similar hipped roofed semi detached properties.

Description of the Proposal

This application seeks full householder planning permission for a hip to gable conversion of the property's main roof which would be attached to the existing two storey side/rear extension, and a rear flat roof dormer which would be located on the existing rear roof slope and the proposed rear roof slope of the hip to gable extension..

Relevant Planning History

The planning history of the site is as follows:

ST/0265/17/HFUL - Two storey side extension and single storey side/ rear extension, rear extension will project 4 metres deep into the garden. Front garden covered with hardstanding, and existing front brick boundary wall to front garden to be retained - Permission Householder with Conditions (decision date - 10/07/2017)

ST/0830/16/HFUL – Two storey side extension and single storey rear extension. Front garden covered with hardstanding with vehicle crossing provided for three cars - Grant Permission Householder with Conditions (decision date - 22/11/2016)

Summary of Consultation Responses

N/A

Summary of Representations

No responses received

Relevant planning policy

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 Council's adopted Local Development Framework (LDF) development plan documents. Those LDF documents of relevance to this application comprise of the Core Strategy 2007 and a Development Management Policies Development Plan Document (DPD) 2011.

The following policies of the South Tyneside Local Development Framework Core Strategy are relevant to this planning application:

- LDF Policy DM1 (A and B)

The following policies and guidance are also relevant to this planning application:

- Supplementary Planning Document 9 (Householder Development)

On 4 March 2025, the Council was directed by the Secretary of State for the Ministry of Housing, Communities & Local Government to submit the South Tyneside Local Plan for examination by 12 March 2025 in accordance with Regulation 22 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012. The Local Plan has been subject to examination in public hearings in July 2025 and January 2026 and is now progressing towards Main Modifications consultation subject to receipt of the Inspectors post-hearing letter. Paragraph 49 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2024) states that local planning authorities may give weight to relevant policies in emerging plans according to:

- the stage of preparation of the emerging plan (the more advanced its preparation, the greater the weight that may be given);
- the extent to which there are unresolved objections to relevant policies (the less significant the unresolved objections, the greater the weight that may be given); and,
- the degree of consistency of the relevant policies in the emerging plan to this Framework (the closer the policies in the emerging plan to the policies in the Framework, the greater the weight that may be given).

Whilst the draft Local Plan is now at a more advanced stage of preparation, the weight that can be given to individual Policies in the Plan varies dependent upon the extent and nature of objections to those Policies. In this regard, it is considered that certain significant weight in assessing this planning application. Relevant Policies are as listed below (with text provided after each Policy regarding the weight that officers consider can be afforded to that Policy):

- LP Policy SP1: presumption in favour of Sustainable Development (limited)
- LP Policy 47: Design Principles (very limited)

National planning policy is also a material consideration in determining this planning application. Relevant national policy comprises the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG), the National Design Guide and the National Model Design Code.

Assessment

The key issues in the assessment of this planning application are as follows:

- Impact on Visual Amenity
- Impact on Residential Amenity

Impact on Visual Amenity

LDF Policy DM1 (A) seeks to preserve visual amenity. It states that the Local Planning authority will ensure, '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.'

NPPF paragraph 131 states that the creation of high quality, beautiful and sustainable 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. Being clear about design expectations, and how these will be tested, is essential for achieving this. So too is effective engagement between applicants, communities, local planning authorities and other interests throughout the process.

NPPF paragraph 135 states inter alia that planning decisions should ensure that developments are visually attractive as a result of good architecture, are sympathetic to local character including the surrounding built environment and maintain a strong sense of place.

NPPF paragraph 139 further 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.

In respect of context, such guidance states that well designed places are based on a sound understanding of the features of the site and the surrounding context, are integrated into their surroundings so they relate well to them and are influenced by and influence their context positively.

In terms of identity, well designed places and buildings have a character that suits their context and are visually attractive.

SPD9 paragraph 11.5 notes that "the appropriateness of a dormer extension is dictated by the type and character of the host dwelling…if an area is not characterised by dormers of any kind, introducing an undesirable precedent should be avoided". Whilst there are a small number of rear and side dormer extensions of different sizes and styles within the surrounding area, the perimeter block of which the application property forms a part doesn't have any dwellings with large flat roofed rear dormers.

Paragraph 11.10 of the guidance states that a hip-to-gable enlargement can often make a house look unbalanced and can also create a terracing effect within a row of dwellings where open views between dwellings are lost. Such extensions will only be considered acceptable where it can be demonstrated that such works would not cause significant harm to the street

scene. In cases where a window is proposed to the extension, favourable consideration will only be given to proposals that would not result in a loss of amenity for residents by way of unreasonable loss of privacy.

The property hosts a two storey side/rear extension where the roof shape matches the roof shape of the existing property and the roof ridge is set down 0.7m from the roof ridge of the main dwelling.

The proposal is to convert the existing hipped roof to a gable roof.

No. 24 is located on the southern side of Ambleside Avenue in the middle of the row of similarly designed hipped roof semi-detached properties. A number of properties host a two storey side extension (including the application property) which is set back from the front elevation of the main dwelling and set down from the roof ridge. No. 67 is located on the north side of Ambleside Avenue at the end of the row of dwellings and hosts a side dormer extension which was granted planning permission in 1996 (ref: ST/0486/96//DM). No properties along Ambleside Avenue host a hip to gable extension.

In some cases, a hip to gable extension could be constructed without requiring planning permission, as it could be classed as permitted development. However, in this instance the proposed hip to gable would be attached to the existing side/rear extension and extend beyond the plane of a roof slope to that extension which forms part of the principal elevation of the dwelling and fronts a highway. Therefore in this instance planning permission is required from the Council for the proposed hip to gable extension.

The proposed hip-to-gable extension would disrupt the visual balance of the pair of semi-detached dwellings of which the application property forms part and also result in significant harm to the character and appearance of the wider street scene, as the design fails to demonstrate appropriate sensitivity to its context. With the exception of the side dormer at No. 67 Ambleside Avenue—situated at the end of the street and therefore exerting no detrimental influence on the wider streetscape—no other properties along Ambleside Avenue feature a hip-to-gable roof form. Introducing such an alteration is therefore considered likely to set an undesirable precedent within the street. Consequently there would be substantial harm to the visual amenity of the area as a result of the proposed development.

In terms of the proposed rear dormer extension, this would also require planning permission from the Council as together with the hip to gable extension it forms a single enlargement of the roof to the property and could not be constructed in the absence of the hip to gable extension.

The rear dormer extension would be set in from the boundaries, set down from the main ridge and up from the main eaves. Whilst not being readily visible from the public domain along Ambleside Avenue, the dormer extension would be highly visible from the public realm on Buttermere Gardens to the rear. Given this, the substantial size of the dormer, its flat roof design and the absence of large rear dormers to other dwellings within the perimeter block of which the application site forms a part, it is considered that the proposed dormer would appear as an incongruous, overdominant and out of character feature in the streetscene and as such would also be harmful to the visual amenities of the locality.

For the reasons outlined above, the proposal is considered to conflict with the guidance contained within SPD9 and would give rise to a visually intrusive and unsympathetic form of development. Refusal is therefore recommended on the basis of the resulting harm to the character and visual amenity of the semi-detached dwellings and the wider area, the failure to accord with adopted design guidance, and the lack of mitigating design measures that might otherwise lessen the proposal's visual impact.

Having regard to the above, the proposed development is considered to result in significant harm to the visual amenity of the area and is considered not to be in accordance with LDF Policy DM1 (A), the Council's SPD9 regarding householder development or the NPPF.

Impact on Residential Amenity

LDF Policy DM1 (B) seeks to preserve residential amenity. SPD 9 sets out guidelines for householder developments.

The proposal is for a hip to gable conversion, and a flat roof dormer to the rear elevation. Due to the nature of the proposal, the works would be visible from a number of surrounding properties, however they are located at a sufficient distance and would not result in any significant negative impacts on the residential amenity of neighbouring properties in respect of loss of outlook, privacy, light or over shadowing. Whilst there is a window in the side elevation of No. 26, this does not serve a habitable room window and so any loss of light or outlook from this window resulting from the proposed development is considered acceptable.

Having regard to the above, the proposed development is considered to give rise to no significant harm to the residential amenity of neighbouring properties and is considered to be in accordance with LDF Policy DM1 (B).

Conclusion

In deciding whether to grant planning permission the Council must have due regard to the 3 equality aims contained in Section 149 of the Equality Act 2010 (the public sector equality duty). A preliminary assessment of the potential equality impacts of any grant of planning permission in this case has been undertaken. There are no apparent equality impacts of the proposed development which give rise to the need to undertake a more detailed equality impact assessment.

The development has been assessed against the provisions of the Human Rights Act, and in particular Article 1 of the First Protocol and Article 8 of the Act itself. This Act gives further effect to the rights included in the European Convention on Human Rights. In arriving at this recommendation, due regard has been given to the applicant's reasonable development rights and expectations which have been balanced and weighed against the wider community interests, as expressed through third party interests / the Development Plan and Central Government Guidance.

Having regard to the above, it is considered that the proposed development would result in significant harm to the visual amenity of the pair of semi-detached dwellings of the which the application property forms a part and the wider streetscene as a result of the overall form, scale and massing of the proposed extension works.

As a result, the proposal is contrary to LDF Policy DM1 (A), SPD9 and national planning policy with regard to its visual impact and therefore it is recommended that planning permission is refused.

Recommendation

Refuse Householder Permission

Refusal Reasons

1 The proposed hip to gable and rear dormer extension would by virtue of its overall form, scale and massing as well as its visibility from the public realm within a locality presently characterised by hipped roofs and an absence of large flat roofed dormers appear as a visually intrusive, unsympathetic, incongruous and over-dominant form of development that would be materially detrimental to, and result in significant harm to, the character and visual amenity of the pair of semi-detached dwellings of which the application property forms a part and the wider street scene. This would be contrary to Policy DM1(A) of the South Tyneside Local Development Framework, the guidance contained within the Council's SPD9: Householder Developments and the NPPF.

Case officer: Emma Thomas
Signed: *E.Thomas*
Date: 28/01/2025

Authorised Signatory: G.Horsman
Date: 03/02/2026

Refused Plan Nos.

ST/PL/0199v01/001 Existing & Proposed received 07/07/2025