

## BOROUGH OF KETTERING

<b>Committee</b>	<b>Full Planning Committee - 12/12/2017</b>	<b>Item No: 5.4</b>
<b>Report Originator</b>	<b>Gavin Ferries Senior Development Officer</b>	<b>Application No: KET/2017/0836</b>
<b>Wards Affected</b>	<b>Ise Lodge</b>	
<b>Location</b>	<b>8 Lawrence Close, Barton Seagrave</b>	
<b>Proposal</b>	<b>Full Application: Single storey side and rear extensions with door, bay window and canopy to front elevation</b>	
<b>Applicant</b>	<b>Mr K Smith</b>	

### 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. The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match, in type, colour and texture, those on the existing building.

REASON: In the interests of visual amenity in accordance Policy 8 of the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy.

## **Officers Report for KET/2017/0836**

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

### **3.0 Information**

#### **Relevant Planning History**

**KET/2016/0164** (No.13 Lawrence Close) Construction of canopy to front with first floor side and single storey rear extensions **permitted** 10 May 2016

**KET/2014/0135** (No.5 Lawrence Close) Single storey side and first floor side extension **permitted** 23 April 2014

#### **Site Visit**

Officer's site inspection was carried out on 30/10/17.

#### **Site Description**

Lawrence Close consists of a variety of house types consisting of hipped and gabled properties which mostly appear as detached properties, however numbers 8, 10 and 12 are attached via their garages which results in them forming a terrace.

#### **Proposed Development**

The application seeks partially retrospective consent for the erection of a single storey rear extension, a single storey side extension (bringing the garage forwards), front bay window and canopy across the front of the building.

#### **Any Constraints Affecting the Site**

None

### **4.0 Consultation and Customer Impact**

#### **Neighbours:**

Letters of objection have been received from 4 properties primarily raising concerns regarding the design of the proposed extensions and the harm it causes to the character of the Close. Concerns were also raised that the works commenced prior to the submission/approval of planning permission

1 of the objectors also raises concern regarding loss of light and overshadowing of the extension to the front of the garage.

### **5.0 Planning Policy**

#### **National Planning Policy Framework**

7. Requiring good design

#### **North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy**

Policy 8 North Northamptonshire Place Shaping

### **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 (including characteristics of the area)
3. Residential amenity

### 1. Principle of development

The application site is located within the urban area of Barton Seagrave and seeks consent for extensions to the existing residential property. The principle of the development is therefore considered to be in accordance with the locational sustainable policies of the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy.

The consideration therefore falls to whether the proposal is acceptable in terms of the design and neighbour impact.

### 2. Design (including characteristics of the area)

There is a variety of housetypes within Lawrence Close including those which have been extended and altered including most recently no.5s and no.13. There is some degree of design coherence that covers No.6, 8, 10 & 12 in terms of the style and character of the buildings, however this is not overtly strong in terms of consistency and the absence of a strong building line (due to the offset positions of no's 6 and 12) and changes which have occurred over time. It is noted that there is not an overriding local distinctiveness of the street when viewed as a whole and this small group of buildings of the same type do not form a sufficiently cohesive or large enough group as a whole to quantify as a discrete area within the street that could be considered as being locally distinct.

Para 60 of the NPPF states;

*Planning policies and decisions should not attempt to impose architectural styles or particular tastes and they should not stifle innovation, originality or initiative through unsubstantiated requirements to conform to certain development forms or styles. It is, however, proper to seek to promote or reinforce local distinctiveness.*

The proposal introduces a canopy across the front of the house (and the front of the extension to the garage). This introduces a full width canopy which does detract from the simplicity in design of the building. However, it is noted that the relocation of the main door from the side to the front of the house and the provision of a porch (or canopy over it) would not require planning permission as they are permitted development under Classes A & D of Part 1 of the permitted development regulations. There are other properties within the road (though of a different original design) that have porches and it is reasonable to expect such alteration would be undertaken if planning permission for the canopy was refused.

The proposed front bay window and full width canopy do not entirely conform to the original design character of the building. However, in the absence of strong local distinctiveness or preserved strong characteristics of buildings within the Close, the dislike or like of these elements falls to be matters of personal taste.

The erosion of character as referenced within some of the objections is noted but in light of the reasonably probable prospect of the permitted development rights being utilised, and the absence of strong distinctiveness, it would be inappropriate to refuse the application on this basis.

The proposal also includes a single storey rear gable ended extension replacing an existing smaller single storey rear extension. Due to the position and scale of the new extension and given the existing extension, the rear extension is not considered to impact on the design or character of the area.

### 3. Residential amenity

The rear extension is 3.3m in length but as it is only single storey and the adjacent dwellings are separated by garages, this does not adversely impact on the amenity of the adjacent properties.

The proposed extension to the garage at the front brings the garage wall in line with the front of the main house. Concerns have been raised by No.6 Lawrence Close that the proposal will adversely impact upon them as a result of the increase in size. The proposed increase in length is 4.3m with the width being 2.3m. Due to the proximity of the main two storey dwelling (of No.8), which is due South of No.6, the proposed single storey which is of limited height and width is not considered to result in significant adverse overshadowing or loss of light to the ground floor window of No.6.

The proposal as a whole given its scale, position and the relationship between properties is not considered to result in unacceptably adverse harm to the residential amenity of the nearby properties.

### Conclusion

The proposed extensions due to their size and positions are not considered to cause unacceptable adverse impact on the amenity of nearby residential properties. In the absence of strong local distinctiveness, the design of the alterations to the building whilst different to the current situation, do not adversely impact on the appearance of the area to the extent that justifies refusal.

#### **Background Papers**

Title of Document:

Date:

Contact Officer:

Gavin Ferries, Senior Development Officer on 01536 534316

#### **Previous Reports/Minutes**

Ref:

Date: