

## DECISION DELEGATED TO DEVELOPMENT MANAGER

**Application No:** H17-0990-18      **Applicant:** Mr J Chapman  
**Proposal:** Single-storey rear extension  
**Location:** 30 Surfleet Road Surfleet Spalding  
**Terminal Date:** 29th November 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 |
|----------------|--------|---------|---------|----------|
| PARISH COUNCIL | 0      | 1       | 0       | 0        |
| WARD MEMBER    | 0      | 0       | 0       | 0        |

### CASE OFFICER ASSESSMENT

This is a householder planning application for single-storey rear extension at 30 Surfleet Road, Surfleet.

The context is predominantly residential. The property is two-storey detached within a defined frontage on eastern side of the road. The site is one of the longest linear narrow plots in the frontage due to the drain crossing behind their rear boundaries.

The site location is open countryside under South Holland Local Plan (2006) although the emerging South East Lincolnshire Local Plan (Publication Version, March 2017) includes the site location within the settlement boundaries of North Gate and West Pinchbeck. Greater weight is given to the emerging plan as it is nearing the end of its Examination in Public rather than the 2006 Local Plan which is closer to be superseded. The principle of development is therefore acceptable unless

material considerations indicate otherwise against local and national planning policies.

The proposed extension would be single-storey. It would project outward 5.84 metres from rear main wall and would be 3.31 metre high with 2.10 metre high eaves. The entire extension would be as wide as the rear wall. The scale, massing and bulking of the proposal would be therefore subservient to the host property.

The floor layout plans show that the aim of the proposal is to convert existing dining room into utility room and lobby and create one large family kitchen dinner room at the rear. Wall infill, new walls and doors are proposed to ensure the access between rooms. The internal alterations are deemed to be acceptable in order to meet the daily needs of occupiers.

A hip roof would be on top of the extension. Its low pitch would avoid blocking the upper rear windows and potentially undermine the amenity in bedrooms on first floor level. Small roof light would be on each roof slope in addition to two bi-fold windows on rear elevation and one single panel door on northern side elevation to lobby. The external materials for the proposal would match those existing in the dwelling.

The design of the extension would satisfactorily enhance the enjoyment of the large family kitchen dinner room without detracting from the character of the dwelling.

A nearly 2 metre high timber close board fence is on both side boundary lines and along the rear boundary. Double sized high mature hedgerow would be also in parallel with southern side boundary of the extension. A separation distance of approximately 1.5 metres on each side is given between the extension and side boundary lines. Opposing elevations of adjacent properties No. 28 and 32 are few metres further away.

On account of its scale and position, the proposed fenestration above-mentioned would not cause any overlooking effect to neighbouring properties. No harm upon residential amenity of adjacent neighbours is anticipated having regard the boundary treatment and separation distances.

Surfleet Parish Council has stated there is no comment for this proposal. No other representation has been made.

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.