



South Tyneside Council

Reference:	260472
Location:	78 Kingsway, South Shields, NE33 3NJ
Ward:	Horsley Hill and Westoe Crown
Description:	Two-storey side/rear extension.
Recommendation:	Grant Permission Householder with Conditions
Case Officer:	Evie Werndly
Case Officer Contact No.:	0191 4247176

Description of the Site

This application relates to a semi-detached property located in a residential area of South Shields.

The applicant property is attached to no.80 to the south-east, and the detached neighbouring property, no.76, is situated to the north-west.

Description of the Proposal

This application seeks full householder planning permission for the construction of a two-storey side/rear extension.

The proposed extension would be constructed above the existing attached garage and would extend beyond the rear elevation of the existing garage by 0.67m. The proposed extension would have a width of 2.93m and be set off from the north-western side boundary with no.76 by 0.23m.

The front wall of the upper storey extension would be set-back from the main front wall of the house by 1m. The proposed extension would host a hipped roof and provide a ridgeline which would be approximately 0.36m lower than the main dwelling ridgeline.

The planning application initially proposed light grey render to the front elevation of the existing property and the proposed extension. However, this would have resulted in significant harm to the visual amenity of the area, as the external surfaces of properties on Kingsway are finished with red brick. As the render would have had an adverse impact upon the street scene and character of the area, the proposal has been amended to alternatively propose red facing brick to match the original dwelling.

Relevant Planning History

No planning history.

Summary of Consultation Responses

N/A.

Summary of Representations

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

- Proposed render would disrupt the architectural symmetry between the applicant property and attached neighbouring property, and harm the character of the street. A rendered property would create an incongruous feature that harms the unified character of the street scene.
- Proposed grey render would look out of place and not be in keeping with the overall character of the neighbouring properties.

The 2no. residents who made representations were notified of the removal of grey render from the proposal. However, it was not considered necessary to undertake a 3-week re-notification period, as the removal of the proposed render would maintain the character of the original dwelling and the immediate area.

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:

- Policy SP1: Presumption in favour of Sustainable Development
- Policy 1: Promoting Healthy Communities
- 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
- Impact on Residential Amenity

Impact on Visual Amenity

Policy 47 of the Local Plan and LDF Policy DM1 (A) set out that all development, including extensions and alterations to existing buildings, shall provide for high-quality design that contributes positively to the character and visual amenity of the borough's townscapes, landscapes and seascapes.

SPD9 states that two-storey side extensions should not be more than half of the width of the original dwelling frontage. The proposed extension would have a width of 2.93m, which is less than half of the width of the original dwelling at first-floor level, which is 3.18m, meaning that the desired subordinate appearance would be achieved. Moreover, the roof ridgeline of the proposed extension would be 0.36m lower than the main dwelling ridgeline. The hipped roof

design would enhance the character of the property, as the first-floor extension would be constructed above the existing attached garage which currently hosts a flat roof.

SPD9 states that two-storey side extensions on semi-detached properties should retain a minimum 1 metre gap between the proposed extension and side boundary of the application site, and provide a 1 metre set-back between the front wall of the upper storey extension and main front wall of the house. However, the existing garage has resulted in a gap along the boundary with no.76 of less than 1 metre. The upper storey of the proposed extension would be set-back from the main front wall of the house by 1m. This would be considered to be acceptable to ensure that a terracing effect would not arise if a first-floor side extension was proposed to no.76, which would be situated on the boundary with no.78. Moreover, several properties within the immediate vicinity host first-floor side extensions which sit flush with the front elevation of the host property, including to no.49 and no.64 Kingsway.

As no.76's garage is built up to the boundary with the applicant property, and the proposed extension would be set off from this boundary by approximately 0.23m, the existing set off between the garage and no.76 would be retained. The properties within the immediate vicinity host attached garages which are built up to the shared boundary, or have resulted in a gap along the common boundary of less than 1m, so this proposed set off would be considered to be acceptable. As a result, 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, red brick, concrete roof tiles, and white upvc windows and doors, would be in keeping with the materials used in the existing dwellinghouse, the attached neighbouring property and wider street 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 Local Plan Policy 47 and LDF Policy DM1 (A).

Impact on Residential Amenity

Policy 47 of the Local Plan and LDF Policy DM1 (B) set out that all development safeguards residential amenity.

Having regard to privacy, the proposed extension would not compromise the level of privacy within the habitable rooms of neighbouring properties. The extension would host 1no. window to the front elevation at first floor level, 1no. window to the rear elevation at ground floor and first floor level, and no windows to the side elevation.

Having regard to outlook, a reasonable outlook would be maintained from the habitable room windows of neighbouring properties. Although there is 1no. window situated in the side elevation of no.76 which would be situated opposite the side elevation of the proposed extension, this window does not serve a habitable room. While the proposed extension would be visible along Kingsway and from the rear of properties on Bamburgh Avenue, the scale and design of the extension would not result in an oppressive visual impact from neighbouring properties. The proposed extension would face the front and rear elevations of adjacent properties at the same distance as the original property and therefore would be acceptable.

Having regard to overshadowing, the proposed extension would not result in the significant overshadowing of habitable windows of neighbouring properties. While the overshadowing of no.76's window in the side elevation at first floor level may occur, this window does not occupy a habitable room.

Given that the two-storey side/rear extension is proposed to the north-western side elevation of the host property, the attached neighbouring property to the south-east, no.80, would not be negatively impacted by the proposed extension.

Having regard to the above, the proposed development is considered to have no significant harm to the residential amenity of neighbouring properties and is considered to be in accordance with Local Plan Policy 47 and 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 for the above it is considered that the proposal would result in no significant harm to the visual amenity of the area or the residential amenity of any neighbouring properties.

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 and Proposed Plans and Elevations with Site Location Plan v.1 - received 03/08/2026

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 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 Local Plan Policy 47 and 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 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

- 2 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).

Case officer: Evie Werndly

Signed: E.Werndly

Date: 12.08.2026

Authorised Signatory: Seán Gallagher

Date: 12/08/2026