DECISION DELEGATED TO DEVELOPMENT MANAGER

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Application No:** | **H02-0981-18** | **Applicant:** | **Mr & Mrs R Wilkinson** |
| **Proposal:** | Proposed single storey extension forming new kitchen, utility, toilet, 2 bedrooms and shower room - re-submission of H02-0236-18 | | |
| **Location:** | 71 Millfield Gardens Crowland Spalding | | |
| **Terminal Date:** | 28th November 2018 | | |

**Planning Policies**

**Local Plan July 2016:**

| | |
|---|---|
| SG1 | General Sustainable Development |
| SG14 | Design and Layout of New Development |
| SG17 | Protection of Residential Amenity |
| SG20 | Extensions and Alterations to Existing Buildings |

**National Guidance**

**National Planning Policy Framework 2018**

Section 12 - Achieving well-designed places

**Representations:**

| | Object | Support | No Obj. | Comments |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| PARISH COUNCIL | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| WARD MEMBER | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| IAN MARSHMAN, HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT OFFICER | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |

**CASE OFFICER ASSESSMENT**

This is a full planning application for a proposed single storey extension to 71 Millfield Gardens, Crowland. The site is within the defined settlement limit for Crowland as set out in the South Holland Local Plan (2006).

The existing dwelling is a two-storey semi-detached property with an existing single-storey

extension to the rear. Existing dwellings on Millfield Gardens are mostly of similar design and are set out in a relatively uniform layout.

This application is a re-submission of H02-0236-18 - A previously refused application for a single storey extension to the rear as well as a two storey extension which would be located partly to the rear as well as projecting from the side of the existing dwelling. The application was refused on the basis that it would result in a form of development which is incongruous in the street scene, does not respect the existing pattern of development in the locality and does not relate well to the existing dwelling. The second refusal reason was that the proposed new single-storey extension, by virtue of its location and proposed positioning of the skylights in relation to the adjacent property's first floor windows, would result in the potential for overlooking into this living space.

This application seeks to address the first refusal reason by proposing a solely single storey extension. The proposed extension would replace the existing single storey extension to the rear and would span the width of the rear of the dwelling, and would also extend out to the side with a staggered side elevation. The proposed extension would form a new kitchen, utility, toilet, 2 bedrooms and shower room. Materials would match those of the original dwelling.

As the proposed extension would still extend to the side of the dwelling, some would be visible from the front above the existing fence, however the visual impact would be much more minimal than that which the previous two storey extension proposed would create. Consequently, it is not considered that the impact on the streetscene would be so significant as to warrant refusal on character grounds.

In terms of residential amenity and the second refusal reason, the proposed roof lights to the kitchen and dining area would be obscure glazed and so there should be no issues of overlooking from the adjacent dwelling, unless the windows were to be opened wide which would be at the discretion of the occupants in any case. Although, there is a window facing into the current garden area (which the extension would extend onto) from a neighbouring property, the only windows on the facing elevation of the proposed extension would belong to a bathroom (which would be obscure glazed) and a utility room (which is not a habitable room). There should therefore not be a material impact in terms of loss of privacy which would justify refusal. No neighbour objections have been received.

Crowland Parish Council have no objections and LCC Historic Environment Officer has commented that there would be archaeological impact.

Taking the above into account, it is considered that the previous refusal reasons have been adequately addressed and that the proposal is in accordance with Policies SG1, SG14, SG17 and SG20 of the South Holland Local Plan (2006), as well as Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2018).

The recommendation is therefore for a delegated approval.