

Allerdale Borough Council
Delegated Planning Application
Householder Officers Report

Reference Number:	HOU/2016/0031
Valid Date:	14/10/2016
Location:	42 St Helens Street Cockermouth
Proposal:	Single storey lean-to to the rear
Applicant:	Mr & Mrs Crawford
Site Visit & Notice Date:	19/10/2016
Site Notice Expiry Date:	09/11/16
Site Notice Location:	Post adjacent to site
Press Notice Expiry Date:	18/11/2016
Consultation Expiry Date:	08/11/2016
Other Publicity:	
Site History:	2/2016/0212 – Replace existing two PVCU windows with new PVCU windows at 42 St Helens Street, Cockermouth – Approved 11/05/16
Dwelling and Plot Description:	Two storey mid terraced dwelling with rear garden (raised)
Gradients:	Rising garden to the rear.
Boundaries and Neighbouring Land Uses:	Residential.
Unauthorised Development:	N/A
Compliance Officer Consulted:	N/A
Policy:	S1 S2 S27 S32 DM15
Other:	

- a) Are the scale, design and materials of the development appropriate for the host dwelling?**

Yes following amendments made by the applicant.

- b) Does the proposal achieve a satisfactory visual and architectural**

relationship with adjoining development/character of the area?

Yes.

c) Does the development become the dominant feature?

No, the proposal is single storey and to the rear of the dwelling.

d) Does adequate curtilage remain?

Yes.

e) Would the proposal result in an unacceptable level of overlooking?

No

f) Would the proposal result in an unacceptable level of overshadowing?

No

g) Would the proposal result in an unacceptable level of overbearing impact?

No. The applicant has amended the position of the proposed extension so that it is set back from the shared boundary with the neighbouring dwelling at 40 St Helens Street.

h) Does the proposal provide adequate access and parking provision?

Not Applicable

i) Other Issues?

Not Applicable

j) Having regard to the requirements of s72 of the P(LBCA) Act 1990, will the proposal preserve and enhance the character or appearance of the conservation area and its setting?

Yes. Letters received in relation to the development suggest that the proposal may be inappropriate development within the Conservation Area. Given that the proposed extension is to be situated to the rear of the dwelling, the proposal has limited impact upon the setting of the Conservation Area.

k) If the property is at risk of flooding, have adequate protection measures been incorporated into the design of the proposal?

Not Applicable

Representations received from public:

Letters have been received from the neighbouring dwelling indicating that the proposal would have an adverse impact upon adjacent residential amenity. As indicated above, the changes made by the applicant would maintain an acceptable standard of residential amenity for the occupants of the neighbouring dwelling.

Likewise, the letters suggest that the proposal would result in run off from the application site creating problems for the neighbouring dwelling. Such is the position of the extension that this is not considered

	to be an issue in determining whether the proposed extension is acceptable.
Consultee Response Highways:	N/A
Consultee Response Town/Parish council:	Recommend approval
Consultee Response other:	N/A
Recommendation:	Approve
	T1 - Time
Conditions/Reasons:	T2 - Drawings
	16.18.04 - Location plan (omitting block plan)
Drawing Numbers:	16.18.03d – Proposed plans and elevations (as amended 8 th December 2016)
Additional Information:	N/A
Notes to Applicant:	
	Application Approved Following Revisions
Proactive Statement:	
Case Officer Signature:	Louise White
Date:	09/01/17
Senior Officer Signature:	Claire Chambers
Date:	12/01/17