

DECISION DELEGATED TO DEVELOPMENT MANAGER

Application No: H16-1060-18 **Applicant:** Mr N Thompson
Proposal: Proposed extension and alterations
Location: 44 Cley Hall Drive Spalding
Terminal Date: 12th December 2018

Planning Policies

Local Plan July 2016:

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
WARD MEMBER	0	0	0	0
HIGHWAYS & SUDS SUPPORT	0	0	0	1
RESIDENTS	1	0	0	0

CASE OFFICER ASSESSMENT

This is a householder planning application for proposed extension and alterations at 44 Cley Hall Drive, Spalding.

The area is purely residential. Most of the dwellings are detached buildings in the immediacy (Cley Hall Drive, Link Way, 27-37 Halmer Gate) showing a wide range of designs, types and appearances. The adjacent house at No. 42 is of similar scale and poorly screened at the front as the application's property. The corner plot of adjacent No. 37 is heavily screened by more than 2 metre high conifer hedgerow on the front line.

The site location is out of the defined settlement limits under South Holland Local Plan (2006) and emerging South East Lincolnshire Local Plan (Publication Version, March 2017). The principle of development is therefore acceptable unless material considerations indicate otherwise against local and national planning policies.

The proposal would substantially alter the layout and design of the building. The existing lounge on the front/southern elevation would protrude outwards 1.80 metre. A 3.20 metre wide bay window would be formed on the front elevation. The northern elevation where there is an existing garage would be recessed approximately 1 metre in line with the rear part thereof.

At the rear of the property, the existing conservatory, utility room and greenhouse attached to it would be removed. A two-storey enlargement of the dwelling protruding 5.30 metres from the main rear wall would be built. Internally most of this material increase is to accommodate a spacious lounge. To the northern side there would be study and utility room which would protrude nearly 1 metre in the form of single-storey gable roofed extension. Its roof pitch would be slightly lower in height which would clearly remark the subservience of this extension to the host property.

Re-roofing would be visually significant. The ridgeline of the main roof would be as high as the existing. The hip roof style would remain in the main roof. However, three roof pitches would be incorporated to the dwelling as a result of three roof windows. The front slope of the main roof would be leaned to join the external wall of the proposed garage forming a roof overhang. A roof canopy would be above the external front wall of lobby and kitchen.

A variety of external materials is proposed for the development. Facing brickwork in the front elevation and front brick wall would match that of the adjacent property No. 42 to north which would aesthetically improve the existing old LBC rustic brickwork. The remainder of external walls will be rendered in white. Strip pantile roof tiles would be replaced for Marley Eternit Blue Black Rivendale which would imitate the slate appearance of the roof tiles of No. 42. Grey horizontal cladding would be in certain parts of the rear elevation.

The resulting layout and design after carrying out the proposal would contribute to upgrade significantly the aesthetics of existing dwelling and this would be sympathetic with the character of the surrounding buildings. In fact, the combination for roof styles would be somewhat similar to that of the adjacent property No. 42 as well as certain external materials.

Having regard to the separation distances and boundary treatment, the proposed development would not harm the amenity of neighbours. The adjacent properties to south (33-37 Halmer Gate) are broadly separated at an oblique angle from the site boundary. Overlooking between opposing windows at their rear elevations would be negligible. The roof window on the northern side elevation would face blank catslide roof slope of No. 42 which is in close proximity so that no adverse impact would be likely.

An objection was made and submitted by residents living in No. 42 on the following grounds:

- Overlooking effect from the bathroom window facing their property.
- A new wall would be erected over the foul drain serving their property.
- The demolition of existing garage next to their boundary is proposed to be demolished and that part of the boundary should be treated.

In view of the grounds of this objection, the agent has proposed the glazing of the roof window to be obscure although it is hereby considered that it does not actually cause any overlooking effect. There is only a blank roof slope with no fenestration.

The other two reasons can be resolved following discussions between the applicant/agent and their neighbours at a later stage. They do not refer to material considerations for which this application cannot be determined now.

The Highways Authority has no concerns regarding the proposed driveway to the main road. No other representations has been received.

In light of considerations above, the proposals are in accordance with Policy SG14, SG17 and SG20 of South Holland Local Plan (2006) as well as Section 12 of National Planning Policy Framework (2018).

It is accordingly recommended to approve this planning application via delegated decision.