

DECISION DELEGATED TO DEVELOPMENT MANAGER

Application No: H02-1115-18 **Applicant:** Mr D Stevens
Proposal: Single-storey rear extension and alterations
Location: 65 Postland Road Crowland Spalding
Terminal Date: 1st January 2019

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	0	0
WARD MEMBER	0	0	0	0
IAN MARSHMAN, HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT OFFICER	0	0	0	1
NORTH LEVEL INTERNAL DRAINAGE BOARD	0	0	1	0

CASE OFFICER ASSESSMENT

Proposal

This is a householder planning application for a single-storey rear extension and alterations to 65 Postland Road, Crowland.

There is an existing single storey extension to the rear which is approximately half the width of the original dwelling and projects approx. 4.5m from the rear elevation. The proposed extension would extend this all the way across the rear elevation and further to the rear, so that it would total approx. 8.5m in depth and width. It would accommodate a new living and dining area, utility room and boot room. Materials of construction would match existing.

Site Description

The existing dwelling is a bungalow which was partly extended at the rear a number of years ago. The property has a long rear garden with hedging and close boarded fencing along the eastern boundary and fencing along the western boundary. There are bungalows either side.

The site is within the defined settlement limit for Crowland as set out in the South Holland Local Plan (2006).

Representations

LCC Historic Environment Officer - No archaeological impact.

North Level District IDB - No comments.

No public objections.

Material Considerations

- Impact upon character and appearance of the area
- Residential amenity

Impact upon character and appearance of the area

The proposed extension would make the existing dwelling substantially larger and it would result in a dwelling larger than the surrounding bungalows. However, as it is located to the rear, public views would be limited, materials of construction would match existing and the roof would be a continuation of the existing pyramid hipped roof of the bungalow. Furthermore, the existing dwelling has a long rear garden which is capable of accommodating the proposed extension without it appearing cramped. It is therefore considered that the proposal is in accordance with Policy SG20 of the Local Plan which allows development which would not adversely alter the appearance of the building, or its architectural relationship with adjoining development or the character of the area. It would also comply with Policy SG14 which seeks, amongst other things, to ensure that development does not have an adverse effect upon the character and appearance of the locality, as well as Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2018 which encourages good design.

Residential amenity

No neighbour objections have been received and it is not considered that the proposal would have a material adverse impact on residential amenity in terms of overlooking, overshadowing or having an overbearing effect. The extension would only be single-storey and due to its relationship with adjacent properties would not have an adverse effect on any habitable rooms in terms of loss of light.

The long rear garden means that an extension of this size can be accommodated without having a material adverse effect of the amount of private outdoor amenity space available to the occupiers.

The application would therefore comply with Local Plan Policy SG17 which seeks to protect residential amenity.

Conclusions

Taking the above into account, it is considered 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.