

Committee Report

Application No:	DC/23/00166/HHA
Case Officer	Samantha Elsender
Date Application Valid	24 February 2023
Applicant	Mr Thomas Hazeldine
Site:	204 Alexandra Road Gateshead NE8 4EB
Ward:	Bridges
Proposal:	Flat roof dormer window to rear roof and single storey extension to rear (amended plans received 04.07.2023)(retrospective)
Recommendation:	REFUSE
Application Type	Householder Application

The Application:

1. DESCRIPTION OF THE SITE
 - 1.1 The application site is a two storey mid-terraced residential dwelling situated on Alexandra Road.
 - 1.2 The property is located close to a corner located in between 206 Alexandra Road and Lincoln Street. The rear yards of the properties adjoin each other and are set at an angle to each other.
- 1.3 DESCRIPTION OF THE APPLICATION
 - 1.4 Retrospective planning permission is sought for the erection of a dormer window and a single storey rear extension.
 - 1.5 The box dormer would be positioned on the whole of the rear roof slope. The dormer would have a width of 5.5 metres, a height of 3 metres and a depth of 2.4 metres.
 - 1.6 The single storey rear extension covers the whole rear elevation of the host property and ties in with an extension already built at 49 Lincoln Street. Due to the orientation of the houses, the extension has a projection of 3.2 metres along the shared boundary with 206 Alexandra Road and 6.2 metres with 49 Lincoln Street (2.9 metres beyond the extension at 49 Lincoln Street. It would have a flat roof height of 3.2 metres with a succah roof light on top of the roof.
- 1.7 RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

564/02 - Planning Permission granted for a lean to rear conservatory - 28/6/2002

2. **Consultation Responses:**

- 2.1 None.

3. Representations

3.1 The Council issued neighbour notification letters to 6 neighbours on the 20th March 2023 and then reconsulted neighbours again on 3rd May 2023 after an amended drawing was received.

3.2 15 Letters of representation have been received - 13 in support and 1 objection.

3.3 The 1 objection submitted against the application is made on the following grounds.

- i) The severe harm the proposed development will have on the level of residential amenity enjoyed at No.49 Lincoln Street;
- ii) The adverse impact the proposed development will have on the character and appearance of the dwelling and surrounding area;
- iii) The impact on biodiversity;
- iv) Will set an undesirable precedent;
- v) Party Wall Act; and
- vi) Application defects.

3.4 The 13 comments of support can be summarised are made on the following grounds:

- i) Works would make a positive contribution to the local area
- ii) Properties are have smaller living areas and extensions to provide minimum living space
- iii) Several other examples in the local area
- iv) Works provide much needed additional space for the family

4. **Policies:**

4.1 NPPF National Planning Policy Framework

NPPG National Planning Practice Guidance

CS13 Transport

CS14 Wellbeing and Health

CS15 Place Making

MSGP15 Transport Aspects of Design of Development

MSGP17 Residential Amenity

MSGP24 Design Quality

HAESPD Householder Alterations- Extensions SPD

5. **Assessment of the Proposal:**

5.1 The main planning issues are considered to be the impact of the proposal on the character of and appearance of the area, the impact on the living conditions of occupiers of adjacent properties and if the proposal raises any highway safety issues.

5.2 IMPACT ON THE CHARACTER AND APPEARANCE OF THE AREA

5.3 Policy MSGP 24 outlines that the design quality of a development will be assessed with regard to the "compatibility with local character including relationship to existing townscape and frontages, scale, height, massing, proportions and form".

5.4 Policy CS15 requires new development to development to "respond positively to local distinctiveness and character".

5.5 Gateshead Council's Household Alterations and Extensions SPD recognises adding dormer windows can significantly alter the appearance of a property. It recommends that "any alterations to your roof should be designed to complement your home and the streets character" and "it is important to avoid any dormer extension looking top heavy and spoiling the appearance of the house.

5.6 The guidance also offers some specific guidance on how to design and appropriate dormer "front, rear and side dormers should be set in 450mm from each common boundary and 450mm above the eaves height of the Property" ... "two separate small dormers will usually be more visually pleasing than one large dormer" ... "The materials used should closely match the existing roof and wherever possible re-use the materials of the existing roof" ... "Dormers should follow the vertical lines of existing windows and match their style and proportions" ... " Flat roofed/box dormers will generally be resisted".

5.7 The proposed dormer would have a width of 5.5 metres and would have a height of 3 metres. The dormer would be sited flush with the eaves, with no set back. The dormer would be set in from the boundary with the neighbour at No.49 Lincoln Street by 0.15 millimetres and would be set down from the ridge of the roof of the main house by 0.5 metres. It would be sited flush with the boundary with the neighbouring dwelling at 206 Alexandra Road. The dormer would be finished in composite slate.

5.8 The dormer proposed is a large and bulky box dormer which does not replicate the detailing or design of the host dwelling. Given the scale and siting of the proposed dormer window with it being sited flush with the rear wall of the property, it would not comply with the permitted development rights afforded to homeowners through Schedule 2, Part 1, Class B of the General Permitted Development Order 2015 (as amended, redacted or re-envoked). As such, there is no permitted development fall back to consider.

5.9 There is one other example of a dormer window at 212 Alexandra Road. There is no record of planning permission for this development although this has been constructed more than four years ago and would now be immune from enforcement action. This is considered to be a poor-quality development which would not comply with the Gateshead Householder Alterations and Extensions SPD, and is not

considered to set a precedent for other dormers which do not comply with the aims of the SPD.

- 5.10 The design of the dormer would appear more akin to an upward third floor extension to the house and would appear as a dominant and discordant feature in the roof scape, which would not respond to the pattern of surrounding development. Given the dominance and massing of the proposal, it is considered that the development would not respond to the local character in relation to its scale, height, massing, proportions and form and would fail to respond to local distinctiveness. The development is contrary to the advice contained within the Householder Alterations and Extension SPD, Policy CS15 and MSGP24 of the Core Strategy and Making Spaces for Growing Places.
- 5.11 A single storey rear extension is also proposed at the dwelling. This would have a flat roof with a gable rooflight and would be constructed of matching materials to the host dwelling. The existing rear boundary walls at the rear lane are of a height to ensure that the proposed extension will largely be obscured from the rear lane setting. Taking account that the development would be constructed of matching materials to the host dwelling, it is considered that the rear extension would not harm the visual amenity of the host dwelling or the street, to have an acceptable impact on the character of the street.
- 5.12 Overall, it is considered the proposed development would conflict with the aims and objectives of the NPPF, Policies CS15 and MSGP24 of the Local Plan for Gateshead and the guidance set out in Gateshead Council's Household Alterations and Extensions Supplementary Planning Document.
- 5.13 RESIDENTIAL AMENITY
- 5.14 Gateshead Householder Alterations and Extension SPD outlines that “any extension to the rear should not dominate neighbouring properties or significantly alter a neighbour's existing level of sunlight, daylight or privacy”...”one of the key objectives is to avoid overshadowing or having an overbearing or oppressive effect of the neighbouring property, thus adversely affecting residential amenity”. The guidance also sets out that extensions should be designed so as not to project beyond a 45 degree line (on plan) that extends from the centre of an adjoining neighbour's nearest ground floor habitable room window.
- 5.15 The proposed extension would be sited to the south of the neighbouring properties at 49 and 47 Lincoln Street. The proposed single storey rear extension will project 6.2 metres along the common boundary with 49 Lincoln Street (2.9 metres beyond that neighbour's extension) and would have a flat roof with a height of 3.2 metres. The projection and height of the extension which is sited 1.2 metres from the main habitable room windows serving the ground floor habitable kitchen would project significantly beyond a 45 degree line.
- 5.16 The height of the proposed development would also break a 25 degree line plotted 2 metres from the ground level of that neighbour. As the development is to the south of the neighbour, the height and depth of the proposed extension would significantly reduce the light and outlook to the neighbour at 49 Lincoln Street.

- 5.17 Whilst the proposed extension would be sited 3.5 metres from the neighbours at 47 Lincoln Street, the height of the rear boundary wall of that neighbour which is approximately 2 metres tall would partially obscure that massing of the extension. As the habitable windows of this neighbour are south facing and would not look directly onto the proposed extension, it is considered that the extension would not harmfully reduce the light and outlook to that neighbour.
- 5.18 The proposed extension would have a depth of 3.2 metres along the common boundary with 206 Alexandra Road. Given that the proposal is to the north of this neighbour and direct sunlight would not be affected by the development, it is considered that the works would not result in harm to the residential amenity of that neighbour.
- 5.19 Due to the siting of the dormer window and the windows of the extension in relation to neighbouring dwellings, it is not considered that the proposal would result in harm to the privacy of neighbours.
- 5.20 It is considered that the proposed rear extension would harmfully reduce the levels of light and outlook afforded to the neighbours at 49 Lincoln Street and is contrary to the guidance in Householder Alterations and Extensions SPD, NPPF and Policies CS14 and MSGP17 of the Local Plan for Gateshead.
- 5.21 HIGHWAY SAFETY
- 5.22 The rear extension would reduce the floor space at the rear yard of the property. However, this was not used for parking purposes. There would not be a loss of parking from the development. There would also be sufficient space as a result of the development for refuse storage, and access to the rear lane would be retained.
- 5.23 The proposal would not have an unacceptable impact on highway capacity, highway safety or parking provision. It is therefore considered that the proposal complies with the NPPF and policies CS13 and MSGP15 of the Local Plan for Gateshead.
- 5.24 OTHER MATTERS
- 5.25 We have sought amended plans from the applicant to ensure that the plans submitted accurately correlate with the works that have progressed on site. Whilst there are minor discrepancies between the drawings and the development that has been constructed, it is considered that we have the information required to consider the impact of the development.
- 5.26 There is a comment in the objection which refers to the impact that the development would have on biodiversity. It is considered that the works would not result in harm to the biodiversity of the area. No ecological appraisals were required as part of the assessment of the application, and householder development are exempt from Biodiversity Net Gain.

5.27 The objection also refers to the Party Wall Act. Whilst noted, this is not a material planning consideration.

6. CONCLUSION

6.1 Taking all the relevant planning policies into account along with all other material planning considerations, it is recommended that planning permission be refused as the proposed rear extension would have a harmful impact on the visual amenity of the host property and wider street scene by virtue of its design, size and scale.

7. **Recommendation**

That permission be REFUSED:

1

The proposed rear extension by virtue of its scale, height and projection on the boundary would result in an unacceptable standard of amenity for adjoining neighbours at 49 Lincoln Street with regard to light and outlook. Therefore, the proposal is not in accordance with policies CS14 and MSGP17 of the Local Plan for Gateshead and the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and the guidance set out in the Householder Alterations and Extension SPD.

2

The proposed dormer window by virtue of its bulk, mass, siting is inappropriate to the host property and surrounding area. The development is contrary to Policies CS15 and MSGP24 of the Local Plan for Gateshead and the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), and the advice contained within the Gateshead Householder Alterations and Extensions SPD.



This map is based upon Ordnance Survey material with the permission of the Ordnance Survey on behalf of the Controller of Her Majesty's Stationery Office © Crown Copyright. Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown copyright and may lead to prosecution or civil proceedings. Gateshead Council. Licence Number LA07618X