

Agenda Item	A13
Application Number	20/00660/FUL
Proposal	Erection of a single storey side and rear extension
Application site	40 Strickland Drive, Morecambe, Lancashire LA4 6TD
Applicant	Mr Joseph Frith
Agent	N/A
Case Officer	Mr Sam Robinson
Departure	No
Summary of Recommendation	Approval

(i) **Procedural Matters**

This form of development would normally be dealt with under the Scheme of Delegation. However, as the applicant is an employee of Lancaster City Council the application must be determined by the Planning Regulatory Committee.

1.0 Application Site and Setting

1.1 40 Strickland Drive is a semi-detached bungalow located in a residential area of Bare. The property features a hipped roof with a dashed exterior, grey roof tiles and white uPVC windows throughout. To the front is a small garden with a driveway to the side leading to a larger rear garden measuring about 100 sq.m and is surrounded by timber fencing. The site is also located within flood zone 2.

2.0 Proposal

2.1 The application seeks consent for a single storey side and rear extension. The proposal measures approximately 3.3m in depth, 5.6m in width with a flat roof height (excluding roof lantern) of 2.7m. The extension features windows and doors to the rear elevation and a floor to ceiling window on the side (southern) elevation. The extension would be finished in dashing to match the existing walls.

3.0 Site History

3.1 The site has no relevant planning history.

4.0 Consultation Responses

4.1 The following responses have been received from statutory and internal consultees:

Consultee	Response
Town Council	No comments received

4.2 No comments have been received from members of the public within the statutory consultation period.

5.0 Analysis

5.1 The key considerations in the assessment of this application are:

- **Design** (NPPF paragraphs 124, 127 & 130: Policy DM35 of the Development Management DPD (2014) and Policy DM29 of the Development Management DPD (2020))
- **Impacts upon residential amenity** (NPPF paragraphs 124, 127 & 130, Policy DM35 of the Development Management DPD (2014) and Policy DM29 of the Development Management DPD (2020))
- **Flood risk** (NPPF paragraphs 163, Policy DM38 of the Development Management DPD (2014) and Policy DM33 of the Development Management DPD (2020))

5.2 Design

5.2.1 In terms of design, the extension remains subservient to the host and appears well proportioned to both the dwelling and site. The matching exterior is considered acceptable while the extension is well sited, set in from both the northern and southern boundaries. As a result, the property will retain sufficient outdoor space for the residents of the property.

5.2.2 The flat roof does provide a small contrast to the hipped roof of the main dwelling, but such is the approximate 15m set back from the highway it will not appear as an obtrusive addition to the area. Considering these matters, the proposal will not cause any visual harm to the existing property or street scene.

5.3 Impacts upon residential amenity

5.3.1 As stated above, the extension is well set in from the side boundaries. Combined with the limited depth of the proposal, the extension will not break the 45-degree rule with the openings on the rear elevations of the neighbouring properties nor will it appear overbearing. The windows/doors on the rear elevation of the extension will overlook the applicant's own rear garden raising no overlooking concerns. There is a single side (southern) facing window but views towards the neighbouring garden space are interrupted by the 1.8m boundary fence. If this fence is retained through condition, there will be no adverse impacts upon residential amenity as a result of this development.

5.4 Flood risk

5.4.1 The property is located within flood zone 2, but given that it is an extension to residential property, a sequential test is not required. In addition to the relatively small-scale nature of the development, the proposal is located on existing hardstanding with the roof water discharged via rainwater goods and through drainage associated with the existing dwelling. As a result, it is considered that there will be no net increase of flooding to properties within the locality of the development.

6.0 Conclusion and Planning Balance

6.1 Due to the relatively small nature of the development involved, the proposal is considered both suitable and appropriate to this residential site. The design is in keeping with the urban area and neither occupies a prominent position within the street nor have a detrimental impact upon flood risk or the residential amenity of the neighbouring properties. As the proposal complies with all the relevant local and national policies listed above, the application is recommended for approval subject to the conditions below.

Recommendation

That Planning Permission **BE GRANTED** subject to the following conditions:

Condition no.	Description	Type
1	Standard three year timescale	Control

2	Development in accordance with amended plans	Control
3	Retention of southern boundary fence	Control

Article 35, Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015

In accordance with the above legislation, Lancaster City Council has made the recommendation in a positive and proactive way to foster the delivery of sustainable development, working proactively with the applicant to secure development that improves the economic, social and environmental conditions of the area. The recommendation has been made having had regard to the impact of development, and in particular to the relevant policies contained in the Development Plan, as presented in full in the officer report, and to all relevant material planning considerations, including the National Planning Policy Framework, National Planning Practice Guidance and relevant Supplementary Planning Documents/ Guidance.

Background Papers

None