



South Tyneside Council

Reference:	260270
Location:	12 Parkshiel, South Shields, NE34 8BU
Ward:	Cleadon Park and Harton Moor
Description:	Alteration and extension to existing property.
Recommendation:	Grant Permission Householder with Conditions
Case Officer:	Emma Thomas
Case Officer Contact No.:	0191 4247593 or 07741105284

Description of the Site

This application relates to a detached dwelling located within a residential area of south Shields.

Description of the Proposal

This application seeks full householder planning permission for a first floor side/rear extension with a Juliet balcony along the side elevation and a single storey side extension.

Following discussions with the agent, the roof ridge of the side extension has been set down and amended plans submitted.

Relevant Planning History

The planning history of the site is as follows:

Ref: ST/0276/17/HFUL

Description: Conservatory to rear elevation

Decision: Grant Permission Householder with Conditions

Decision Date: 27/06/2017

Ref: ST/0208/01//DM

Description: Proposed side and rear single storey extension

Decision: Grant Permission

Decision Date: 27/04/2001

Summary of Consultation Responses

No responses were received in response to the statutory consultation period which ended on 15/07/2026.

Summary of Representations

2 no. representations have been received in objection to the proposal. The issues raised are:

- Concerns that the first floor side extension will make the closet property look smaller;
- Concerns over loss of privacy in the garden;
- Would like a weekend work and late work outside of normal office hours restriction

Officer Comment – Issues relating to the construction process are not material planning matters.

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 statutory development plan comprises the Council's adopted South Tyneside Local Plan 2023-2040. Relevant policies are listed below:

- Local Plan Policy SP1: Presumption in favour of Sustainable Development
- Local Plan Policy 1: Promoting Healthy Communities
- Local Plan Policy 47: Design Principles
- Local Plan Policy 3: - Pollution
- Local Plan Policy 43: Development Affecting Designated Heritage Assets
- Local Plan Policy 47: Design Principles

The Local Development Framework (LDF) development plan documents also remain part of the development plan at the current time.

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; and
- Impact on Residential Amenity

Impact on Visual Amenity

LDF Policy DM1 (A) seeks to preserve visual amenity.

No. 12 has previously been extended with a single storey side extension and rear conservatory. The side (south facing) elevation and rear elevation of no. 12 are partially visible from the public domain along Parkshiel due to the angle of the property within the estate, however this is viewed over a distance over a public green where many trees (with Tree Preservation Orders) are located.

The adjacent neighbour has commented stating that the proposed side extension will make their property look smaller. Many properties within the estate have had extensions built previously, in particular no. 16 and 38 Parkshiel which host a two storey side and rear

extension. The side extension would also host a roof ridge set down which would create a subordinate appearance.

SPD9 sets out that 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.

SPD9 also states that 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.

The property is detached and is not located within a high-density estate. However, many properties within the estate have had extensions built and in particular no. 16 and 38 Parkshiel, which host a two storey side and rear extension. The side extension would also host a roof ridge set down which would create a subordinate appearance.

SPD9 also states that 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. In this instance the proposed side extension would host a width of approx. 4.28m which is less than half the width of the main dwelling, which measures a total of 10.35m wide. Therefore it is considered that it would not compromise the character of the property and street. In this regard and given the location of this element of the proposal, the two storey side element is considered acceptable in visual amenity terms.

In terms of the proposed two storey rear extension, SPD 9 states that two-storey rear extensions that would project 3 metres from the rear wall of the original dwelling, and be set in 2 metres from the any side boundary and 7 metres from the rear boundary (opposite the rear wall of the dwelling) will often be 'permitted development'. Although the two storey rear extension would project 3.27m from the rear of the proposed side extension, it would only be marginally more than 3m. It would be visible from the public domain along Parkshiel, however it would be viewed over a distance and considered to not adversely impact the street scene.

The proposed first floor Juliet balcony along the side elevation would also be considered to be acceptable in terms of impact on the dwelling and street scene, as this would be viewed over a distance through trees.

In terms of the single storey side extension, it would be set behind the existing detached double garage and therefore marginally visible from the public domain. Nevertheless it would be acceptable in terms of visual amenity.

The proposed development would be of an acceptable scale and massing having regard to the existing host property and to the surrounding area. The proposed materials would be in keeping with the materials used in the existing dwellinghouse and as such would be considered to be acceptable.

Having regard to the above, the proposed development is considered to have no significant harm to the visual amenity of the area and is considered to be in accordance with LDF Policy DM1 (A).

Impact on Residential Amenity

LDF Policy DM1 (B) and Local Plan Policy 47 seeks to preserve residential amenity. SPD 9 sets out guidelines for householder developments.

No. 9 Parkshiel is located north west of no. 12 and faces away from no. 12. This property is located at least 16m from no. 12 which is considered a sufficient distance that there would be no harm to the residential amenity of that property.

The two storey side and rear extension would not be visible from any habitable rooms windows of no. 13 Parkshiel. It is considered that these aspects of the development would therefore not result in any significant harm to the residential amenity of No. 13, particularly in terms of overshadowing, loss of outlook, overdominance and loss of privacy. The proposed single storey extension would be set 2.3m from the boundary with No. 13. There would be no windows facing towards that boundary and so there would be no loss of privacy to that property. Given the scale and massing of the single storey extension there would be no significant harm in terms of overshadowing, loss of outlook or overdominance to No. 13.

The proposed two storey side and rear extension at no. 12 would be visible from a number of properties along Parkshiel, however they are located at a sufficient distance so that there would be no harm to their residential amenity. Taking the above into account, the proposed development at no. 12 is considered to be acceptable in terms of loss of outlook, privacy, overdominance and overlooking.

Therefore the proposal would be acceptable in relation to the consideration of the residential amenities of the surrounding neighbours and would be in accordance with LDF Policy DM1 (B) and Local Plan Policy 47.

Other Matters

Concerns were raised by a neighbouring property regarding the potential impact on trees in the area. A number of trees within the vicinity are subject to a Tree Preservation Order (TPO) however given the scale and nature of the development it is considered that there would be no significant harm to any trees.

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 for the above it is considered that the proposal would result in no significant harm to the visual amenity of the area, the residential amenity of any neighbouring properties or the highway safety of the area.

As a result, it is considered that the proposed development complies with all relevant local and national planning policy and guidance. Consequently, this application is recommended for approval.

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 & Proposed Elevations & Floor Plans Rev 2 – Received 13/08/2026

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 stated in the submitted application form (received 01/05/2026). 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 Approval of a Biodiversity Gain Plan NOT REQUIRED before development commences

The effect of paragraph 13 of Schedule 7A to the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 is that planning permission granted for the development of land in England is

deemed to have been granted subject to the condition "(the biodiversity gain condition)" that development may not begin unless:

- (a) a Biodiversity Gain Plan has been submitted to the planning authority, and
- (b) the planning authority has approved the plan.

However, based on the information available, this permission is considered to be one which will not require the approval of a biodiversity gain plan before development is begun because one or more of the statutory exemptions or transitional arrangements are considered to apply - please refer to Biodiversity net gain: exempt developments - GOV.UK (www.gov.uk).

- 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 Mining Remediation Authority on 0345 762 6846 or if a hazard is encountered on site call the emergency line 0800 288 4242.

Further information is also available on the Mining Remediation Authority website at: Mining Remediation Authority - GOV.UK

Case officer: Emma Thomas

Signed: Emma Thomas

Date: 15/09/2026

Authorised Signatory: Seán Gallagher

Date: 22/09/2026