

BOROUGH OF KETTERING

Committee	Full Planning Committee - 11/02/2014	Item No: 5.1
Report Originator	Christina Riley Senior Development Officer	Application No: KET/2013/0666
Wards Affected	Welland	
Location	14 Hermitage Road, Brampton Ash	
Proposal	Full Application: Conversion of outbuildings	
Applicant	Mr P Martin	

1. PURPOSE OF REPORT

- To describe the above proposals
- To identify and report on the issues arising from it
- To state a recommendation on the application

2. RECOMMENDATION

THE DEVELOPMENT CONTROL MANAGER RECOMMENDS that this application be APPROVED subject to the following Condition(s):-

1. The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of 3 years from the date of this planning permission.

REASON: To comply with Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) and to prevent an accumulation of unimplemented planning permissions.

2. Notwithstanding the provisions of Article 3 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (or any Order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification) no additional openings permitted by Schedule 2, Part 1 Classes A or C shall be made in the eastern elevation or roof plane (adjacent No 16 Hermitage Road) of the building.

REASON: To protect the amenity and privacy of the occupiers of adjoining property in accordance with policy 13(l) of the North Northamptonshire Core Spatial Strategy.

3. No development shall commence on site until details of the types and colours of all external facing and roofing materials to be used, together with samples, have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall not be carried out other than in accordance with the approved details.

REASON: In the interests of the visual amenities of the area in accordance with policy 13 (h, i and o) of the North Northamptonshire Core Spatial Strategy.

Officers Report for KET/2013/0666

This application is reported for Committee decision because there are unresolved, material objections to the proposal.

3.0 Information

Relevant Planning History

RU/69/02: Conversion of 3 domestic stores to garages.

Site Description

Officer's site inspection was carried out on 13 and 16 November 2013.

The application site is located within the designated Conservation Area of Brampton Ash, and consists of a two-storey stone and slate roofed semi-detached dwelling (No. 14: application site and the attached property of No. 12), with two single storey outbuildings. One of the outbuildings is stone and slate and runs parallel with the application sites boundary with the road, but set back by some 15m. This outbuilding is shared across the boundary with No. 16 Hermitage Road. The second outbuilding is to the rear of the first and is a stone building with a tin roof. The ground rises up from the road to the rear of the site.

To the rear of the house and outbuildings is a long beyond which is open countryside. To the north is No. 12 (attached to the application site dwelling). To the south is No. 16 a two-storey semi-detached stone and slate dwelling. The rear garden of No. 16 is lower than the garden level of No. 14. No. 14.12 and 16/18 Hermitage Road are the same design and appear to date from the same era.

To the front of the site, on the opposite side of the road are No.3 (brick and plain tile dwelling) and 5 Hermitage Road (rendered and slate dwelling), both of which are at least 30 m from the outbuildings.

Proposed Development

The application proposes a link between the existing dwelling and the outbuildings that run parallel with the road. A further link is proposed between this outbuilding and the outbuilding behind. It is also proposed to raise the roof this outbuilding from 2.0m at the eaves and 3.4m at the ridge (measurement taken from exterior ground level at rear) to 2.8m at the eaves and 4.6m to the ridge. The applicants propose to reduce the internal floor level, giving greater headroom. The tin roof will be replaced with slate.

The plans also show the conversion of the outbuildings to additional accommodation, and a number of associated changes to the exteriors, including the replacement of large 'garage' doors with glass.

Planning permission was granted in 1969 (RU/69/2) for the conversion of this building from storage to domestic garages. At this time a central

window under the gable projection was replaced with a garage door, and small front projecting extensions under a 'catslide roof' were added to either side of the gable to accommodate two new garages. The garage doors replaced two much smaller windows. As a result the garages have a domestic use. No conditions were attached to this planning permission removing permitted development rights. As a result the conversion of these buildings to living accommodation remaining ancillary with the occupation of the house as part of the same planning unit, and the exterior changes do not require planning permission.

As a result of officers concerns about the additional height proposed for the second outbuilding, amended plans have been received showing a reduction in height of 300mm.

Amended plans have also been received in response to the neighbours and parish council's comments highlighting various errors/inconsistencies.

Any Constraints Affecting The Site

Within Brampton Ash Conservation Area

4.0 Consultation and Customer Impact

Parish/Town Council

Unable to support the application in its present form due to: -

Apparent discrepancies in plans including boundary with the neighbouring property (no.12) incorrectly drawn and boundary lines shown on the inset location plan and the floor plans are inconsistent. There is no drawing provided of the south-west elevation.

The proposed rear extension roofline is not shown clearly and does not illustrate the proposed works relative to neighbouring properties: this makes it impossible to get a clear perspective of the proposal in context with its neighbours.

Design: The large expanse of glass linkage between the original building and the proposed extension was visually incongruous and does not fit well with the overall character of the existing and adjacent buildings, which date mainly from the Georgian era and are largely built of slate and stone: councillors would prefer to see the symmetry of the existing buildings maintained.

The large 3-panelled floor-to-ceiling window on the proposed south elevation, drawing no. 13.006, be replaced with glazing of a more subtle appearance and suggest that this could possibly be, for example, a mock garage-door type of glazed unit in a suitable design.

The planning application form states that Foul Sewage and surface

water will be disposed of via a mains sewer: properties in Brampton Ash drain to septic tanks.

Planning application form section 10 (Materials) seeks to emphasise the divide between the existing building and the extension by using differently coloured mortar: parish councillors expressed their reservations about the suitability of this.

Neighbours

One letter has been received objecting to the proposal on the following grounds: -

Inaccuracies in plans including; Boundary drawn incorrectly; existing building not shown, this needs to be taken into account as it makes a difference to the appearance of the proposal; details of neighbouring outbuilding and dwelling incorrectly shown and details of the SW elevation which borders objectors property are missing.

Full length glass windows would not be in keeping with the architecture of our conservation village. 3 very different doors/windows would ruin the symmetry of the building and therefore spoil the appearance.

To construct a link in glass would be totally different to previously allowed developments and spoil the appearance from the road.

In fact the overall excessive use of glass in a house built in 1844 and next to buildings dating from 1842 and 1843 is to the detriment of the appearance of the village. Many of the houses with extensions have used stone, and favoured Georgian windows; even at the back of the properties. At the front, planning officers, in the past, have insisted on Georgian windows in order to retain the character of the village.

Development will encroach upon objectors land.

The extension to the outbuilding would impair the view from the front and seriously overshadow our property causing the access to the oil tank and coal bunker to be very dark. It would also reduce light to the windows to our property facing the SW elevation.

We also have concerns about drainage from the proposed extension as there would be an increase in roof area. We are not sure how run off from the roof would be prevented from draining onto the roof of our covered store housing a coal bunker and oil tank. The roof is far too small to accommodate any more run off. Any additional water could result in the flooding of our property.

Wastes cannot drain into main sewers as stated as there are none in the village. Houses 18, 16, 14 and 12 share a septic tank. Additional

drainage could have a serious impact on the septic tank.

We believe the wall to the rear of our oil tank is part of our property yet it is incorporated into the proposed building.

We also have concerns about the effect of any underpinning to our property.

We have no objections to the renovation of the outbuilding as long as there is no increase in height.

We would also like to point out that there is no right of access to the rear of our property and any building work would have to be completed from the land of 14.

5.0 Planning Policy

National Planning Policy Framework

Paragraph 17 – Core planning principles

Policy 7– Requiring good design

Policy 12 – Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

Development Plan Policies

North Northamptonshire Core Spatial Strategy

Policy 1 - Strengthening the network of settlements

Policy 13 - General sustainable development principles

6.0 Financial/Resource Implications

None

7.0 Planning Considerations

The key issues for consideration in this application are:-

1. Principle of development
2. Design and Impact on Character of the Area
3. Impact upon neighbours and amenity
4. Comments on other points raised by proposal

1. Principle of development

National planning policy in the NPPF is a material consideration in planning decisions. Paragraph 14 of the NPPF states that there is a presumption in favour of sustainable development. Paragraphs 6 and 7 detail that the purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development which has economic, social and environmental dimensions.

Policy 13 of the NNCSS supports householder development provided

that the proposals do not result in an adverse impact upon residential amenity or the highway network and that the proposals present a good standard of design which does not have an adverse impact upon the character and appearance of the area.

The proposal is for an extension to an existing dwelling within the curtilage of that dwelling. As such, the proposed development accords with the policies as set out in the paragraph above and the principle of this type of residential development in this area subject to all other material considerations as outlined below is established.

2. Design and Impact on Character of the Area

Good design, character and appearance of proposals are promoted by Section 7 'Requiring Good Design' of the National Planning Policy Framework. Policy 13(h) of the North Northamptonshire Core Spatial Strategy requires that development is of a high quality of design and respects and enhances the character of its surroundings and is in accordance with the environmental character of the area.

The property is located within the designated conservation area for Brampton Ash, and as such there is a statutory requirement under Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 that when determining an application, regard must be made to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the conservation area.

The application proposes a glass link between the existing house and outbuildings. There have been objections to the use of glass, with suggestions that stone would be more in keeping with the surrounding area. It is acknowledged that stone is a characteristic building material within the Conservation Area however the use of glass in the link will allow the proposal to be read as a later addition and thus preserve the readability of the buildings original fabric. It also serves to maintain the historic separation between the house and outbuilding. In addition the link is small scale and to an extent will be screened from oblique views by the existing buildings on site. Glass is therefore, considered to be an acceptable material in this instance.

A glass link is also proposed between the two outbuildings. It is unlikely that any of this window will be seen from the road, as it will be screened by the existing house and outbuildings, however if it is the arguments for the use of glass present above, are the case here. Glass is therefore, considered to be an acceptable material in this location.

The two storey rear building will be largely screened from view from Hermitage Road by the existing outbuilding. The ridge of the main body of the building runs parallel with, (albeit higher than) that of the existing outbuilding, whilst the pitch of the gable reflects that of the gable on the outbuildings. It remains subservient to the existing dwelling and will also be viewed next to a two-storey extension at the neighbouring property,

which presents its gable end to the road. It is recommended a condition be placed upon the consent, requiring all external materials to be used in the construction of the proposal to be first submitted to, and approved by the planning authority. This is considered appropriate given its location within a conservation area.

With the attachment of the condition relating to materials the proposal is considered to be an appropriate form of development for this property, and as such it will not have an undue or detrimental impact upon the preservation of the conservation area.

3. Impact upon neighbours and amenity

Policy 13(l) of the North Northamptonshire Core Spatial Strategy requires that development will not result in an unacceptable impact on the amenities of neighbouring properties, by reason of noise, vibration, pollution, loss of light or overlooking. Paragraph 17 of the NPPF (Core Planning Principles) states planning should 'always seek to secure ... a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupiers of land and buildings.'

The impact of each element of the proposal requiring planning permission is considered below:

Glazed link:

No 12 and 14 Hermitage Rd are screened from the glazed link by the existing dwelling and outbuilding. No 3 Hermitage Road is over 28m from the link and No. 5 Hermitage Road is over 55m. These distances, plus the fact that the link is likely to be a space through which people will pass, rather than spend any length of time means that any additional overlooking of neighbouring dwellings from the link will be minimal. The location of the link between existing dwellings means there will be no overshadowing of neighbouring properties.

Raised roof and alterations to outbuilding to rear:

The raised roof of the second outbuilding runs along the boundary between No. 14 and 16. The proposed wall is blank, preventing any overlooking. Permitted development rights in relation to any new openings in this elevation and the associated roof will be removed, to ensure the situation remains as it is. There will be some additional overlooking of the garden of No.16 from the window and Juliet balcony which have been introduced into the in the rear elevation of the extension as a result of the additional height however this garden is already overlooked by No's 14 and 18 Hermitage Rd and the additional overlooking created by one window is not considered sufficient to warrant a refusal of the application.

I have viewed the application site from the neighbouring property at No.16. The increased height of the outbuilding may lead to some additional overshadowing of the access way to No.16' oil tank and coal

bunker, however this area cannot be considered to be habitable space and the application cannot be refused for this reason. There will be some additional overshadowing to two windows in the wall opposite the outbuilding. The objector has confirmed that one window serves a downstairs toilet; which is not considered to be a habitable room. The second window serves a study, whilst this is a habitable room, the overshadowed window is not the only source of light to this room. As the overshadowing will be to a non-habitable room and a habitable room which has an additional source of natural light I therefore consider that the application is acceptable in this respect.

There is the potential for additional overlooking of rear parts of No. 12's garden, from the new first floor window in the eastern elevation (again introduced as a result of the increased height) however this garden is already overlooked by the main dwelling at No's 14 and the additional overlooking generated by this window is not considered to warrant a refusal of the application.

The glazed link between the two outbuildings also serves as a staircase, again as this is space that will be passed through rather than lived in, overlooking from this area will be limited. The host dwelling lies between the area of glazing and No. 12 (and that part of No. 12's garden nearest to the house) further reducing the impact of this part of the proposal.

No 3 and 5 Hermitage Road are on the opposite side of the road to the proposal, over 40 and 60m respectively away. In addition the majority of the additional height will be obscured by the existing outbuilding which is located to the front of the extension. The proposal will have no adverse impact on the residential amenity enjoyed by residents of these dwellings. There are no dwellings to the rear of the site.

To conclude, it is considered the proposed scale, siting and design of the development proposed will minimise any potential amenity impact on its neighbours and that no unacceptable harm to neighbouring amenity would result from the proposal.

4. Comments on other points raised by proposal

As explained earlier in the report the changes to the front elevation of the first outbuilding do not require planning permission.

Comments about the apparent discrepancies on the plans regarding the boundary line are clarified on the amended plan as part of the red line of the site.

Matters of encroachment, disputes over ownership, drainage, underpinning, rights of access are not material consideration in the determination of this application. The applicant's attention will be drawn to the Party Wall Act which deals with many of these issues.

The applicants have confirmed that foul sewage and surface water will be disposed of via septic tanks and that the number of people living in the dwelling is not proposed to increase as a result of this proposal. Concerns about the impact of this proposal on the shared septic tank are not a material consideration in the determination of the application.

Conclusion

The proposal is considered to have an acceptable impact on the character of the Conservation Area and thus accords with Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 and the policies 13 of the CSS and 12 of the NPPF. Whilst the proposal will have some impact on the amenity of neighbours this will not be so significant as to justify a refusal of planning permission. The application is therefore in accordance with policies 1 and 13 of the CSS and 7 and 12 of the NPPF.

Background Papers

Title of Document:

Date:

Contact Officer:

Christina Riley, Senior Development Officer on 01536 534316

Previous Reports/Minutes

Ref:

Date: