

Application Number:	2017/1109/HOU
Site Address:	51 Montaigne Crescent, Lincoln, Lincolnshire
Target Date:	7th December 2017
Agent Name:	John Haynes Architectural Design
Applicant Name:	Ms R Casey
Proposal:	Erection of single storey extensions to front, side and rear elevations.

Background - Site Location and Description

The application proposes single storey extensions to the front, side and rear of 51 Montaigne Crescent. The property is a detached bungalow.

The application is brought before Planning Committee as the applicant is an employee of the City of Lincoln Council.

Site History

No relevant site history.

Case Officer Site Visit

Undertaken on 17th October 2017.

Policies Referred to

- National Planning Policy Framework
- Policy LP26 Design and Amenity

Issues

- Impact on Visual amenity
- Impact on Residential Amenity
- Impact on Highway Safety

Consultations

Consultations were carried out in accordance with the Statement of Community Involvement, adopted May 2014.

Statutory Consultation Responses

Consultee	Comment
Highways & Planning	No Response Received

Public Consultation Responses

No responses received.

Consideration

National and Local Planning Policy

Paragraph 56 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, is indivisible from good planning, and should contribute positively to making places better for people.

Paragraphs 63 and 64 are also key in highlighting that applicants should take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions. Buildings and extensions should promote high levels of sustainability through good design and weight will be given to outstanding or innovative designs which help raise the standard of design more generally in the area.

Policy LP26 of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan adopted April 2017 relates to design and amenity standards and requires that all development, including extensions and alterations to existing buildings, must achieve high quality sustainable design that contributes positively to local character, landscape and townscape, and supports diversity, equality and access for all.

Impact on Visual Amenity

With regard to visual amenity, the front addition would extend the majority of the width of the elevation and would project 1.2 metres from the front. An existing porch would be removed to accommodate the proposal. This hipped roof extension would contain two windows in the front and a door in the side. Officers are of the opinion that the front extension would be a minor addition to the property and would not appear unduly prominent when viewed from the wider area.

The side extension would be wider towards the rear of the bungalow resulting in two gables facing the side boundary. The extension would be set back 0.9 metres from the existing front elevation with a roof to slope away from Montaigne Crescent. It is considered that the extension would sit comfortably within the plot and would not appear unduly prominent when viewed from Montaigne Crescent.

The existing property is constructed from light buff brick and the front and side extensions which are visible from the street would be constructed from bricks to match as close as possible, with the rear constructed of render. Given the varied brick types in the area, Officers do not raise objections to the chosen materials.

Overall, it is considered that the proposals are acceptable and would not be harmful in terms of visual amenity.

Impact on Residential Amenity

In terms of the impact of the extension on residential amenity, part of the side extension would be positioned approximately 0.9 metres from side boundary with No. 49 Montaigne Crescent, the remainder of the extension would be wider and positioned on the boundary. The majority of the extension is positioned adjacent to the side elevation of neighbouring No. 49 and there is a small window within the side of No. 49 which faces the application site. The window has limited outlook given its existing position approximately 1 metre away from the close boarded boundary fence. The window would be adjacent to the part of the

extension that is on the boundary, however, this would be the part of the extension where the roof would meet the eaves and would therefore not be significantly higher than the existing fence. Furthermore, the neighbouring property is positioned to the west of the application property therefore loss of sunlight would be limited. Officers are therefore satisfied that the impact on the side window of No. 49 would not be unduly harmful.

There are windows proposed in the side elevation of the extension to the kitchen and bathroom, although the close boarded fence would ensure privacy is maintained between the two properties. A garage would be removed on the boundary with No. 49 to accommodate the side/rear projection. Given the position of the existing garage, on balance, it is not considered that the side/rear extension would cause a harmful impact on No. 49.

With regard to impact on No. 53 Montaigne Crescent, the extension would project 5.1 metres from the original rear elevation. There is an existing conservatory projecting approximately 3 metres which would be removed to accommodate the proposal. The extension would have a roof sloping away from No. 53 with a separation from the boundary of approximately 1 metre. Given its single storey nature, it is not considered that the extension would be overbearing or cause an unacceptable degree of loss of light when viewed from this neighbouring property. There are no windows in the side elevation facing No. 53 and therefore privacy would be maintained between the two properties.

It is not considered that there would be any further residential properties impacted upon by the proposal and overall the extension is acceptable in terms of its impact on residential amenity.

Impact on Highway Safety

A separation of 5.5 metres has been retained between the extension and the front boundary which is considered sufficient to enable a car to be parked on the driveway. It is not considered that highway safety will be compromised by the proposal.

Application Negotiated either at Pre-Application or During Process of Application

Initial advice given by Officers.

Financial Implications

None.

Legal Implications

None.

Equality Implications

None.

Conclusion

The proposed extension would not cause unacceptable harm to visual amenity, residential amenity or highway safety, in accordance with the relevant policies of the National

Planning Policy Framework and Central Lincolnshire Local Plan.

Application Determined within Target Date

Yes.

Recommendation

That the application is granted conditionally.

Standard time limit and plans conditions