BOROUGH OF KETTERING

Committee	Full Planning Committee - 13/03/2018	Item No: 5.9
Report	Sean Bennett	Application No:
Originator	Senior Development Officer	KET/2018/0089
Wards	Ise Lodge	
Affected		
Location	6 Gough Close, Kettering	
Proposal	Full Application: Two storey side extension	
Applicant	Mr & Mrs M Rogers	

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 development hereby permitted shall not be carried out other than in accordance with the approved plans detailed below.

REASON: In the interest of securing an appropriate form of development in accordance with policy 8 of the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy.

3. 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 dwelling.

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

4. Notwithstanding the provisions of Article 3 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (or any Order revoking and reenacting that Order with or without modification) no additional openings permitted by Schedule 2, Part 1 Classes A or C shall be made in the side elevations or roof plane of the extension.

REASON: To protect the amenity and privacy of the occupiers of adjoining property in accordance with Policy 8 of the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy.

Officers Report for KET/2018/0089

This application is reported for Committee decision because there is an unresolved, material objection to the proposal

3.0 Information

Relevant Planning History

None relevant to property, although an implemented permission at the adjacent property (7 Gough Close) is relevant:

KE/89/0036 - [two storey side] extension to dwelling - APPROVED - 15/02/1989

Site Visit

Officer's site inspection was carried out on 16/02/2018 and 28/02/2018

Site Description

The application site comprises a 1960-70's buff brick semi-detached house under a brown tiled roof with front white horizontal facia board and a side/front single storey hipped roof element which includes a converted garage. To the front the property has hard-standing for two vehicles and a small front lawn.

The area comprises similar dwellings, many of which have been extended with variance to their external materials.

Proposed Development

The application seeks full planning permission for a side two storey extension set 3.2m back from the front of the dwelling with a lower ridge height and includes a rear projecting gabled element which extends approximately 2m from the rear wall of the existing property. The proposal is intended to be constructed in matching materials.

Any Constraints Affecting the Site

None

4.0 Consultation and Customer Impact

Neighbours: One third party **objection** received from a neighbouring resident at 7 Gough Close to the north. They say the following:

We are opposed to the proposed application for three reasons:

- 1) Its height, as a two storey extension
- 2) Its proximity to our boundary
- 3) The fact that it extends into the rear garden

We feel that this will overshadow our garden and back rooms of our house. This factor will detract significantly from the use and enjoyment we currently get from our garden and conservatory. We note that no other similar two storey extensions in the area.'

5.0 Planning Policy

National Planning Policy Framework Core principles and Chapter 7 (Requiring good design)

Development Plan Policies

North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy (JCS): Policy 8: Place shaping

Local Plan (LP): Policy 35. Housing: Within Towns

6.0 **Financial/Resource Implications**

None

7.0 Planning Considerations

The key issues for consideration in this application are:-

- 1. The principle of the development
- 2. Impact on the character and appearance of the area
- 3. Impact on residential amenity
- 4. Impact on highway safety and convenience
- 5. Response to objector

1. The principle of the development

As the site is located within the Town's designated boundaries as defined by Saved Policy 35 of the Local Plan and associated with the dwellings domestic use the proposal is considered to be acceptable in principle.

2. Impact on the character and appearance of the area

Policy 8 (d) of the JCS seeks development to respond to local character consistent with Chapter 7 of the NPPF.

The character of the area is derived from the set-back of the dwellings from the highway edge and their spacing's which give a pleasant spaciousness with the use of different facia materials creating interest. Some of the areas original openness has been eroded over the years by side extensions.

The set-back of the extension mirrors that evident at 7 Gough Close adjacent and would retain a 2m gap between the extended neighbouring property and the proposal. The roof ridge is also 1m lower than the existing. As such the proposal would be seen within the streetscape as a subservient extension consistent with its neighbour and retain a good separation gap between pairs of semi-detached dwellings and thereby sit comfortable in its context. Whilst the two storey rear projecting element may not be entirely consistent with its neighbour it has a relatively modest scale, not readily visible from the public realm and consists of a simple inoffensive design to a rear area. The proposal shall be conditioned to be

constructed of matching materials.

As such the proposal is considered to respect the character and appearance of the area and the property consistent with Policy 8 (d) of the JCS and therefore is acceptable in this regard.

3. Impact on residential amenity

Policy 8 (e) of the JCS seeks to secure a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings.

Due to the modest rear projection of the proposal it would not have a harmful impact to neighbours at 56, 58 and 60 St Johns Street to the rear/east with a separation distance of at least 19m between opposing windows. Also because of its location to the north/side elevation of the host dwelling the proposal would not have any notable impacts toward the attached neighbour at 5 Gough Close to the south with no upper floor windows proposed in the facing side elevation. A condition shall be attached preventing any upper floor side windows being created in the future.

Moving on to the impacts to 7 Gough Close; as no windows are proposed in the side elevation of the extension and because the upper floor window would directly face the rear garden of the host property the proposal would not cause loss of privacy towards that neighbour. A condition shall be attached preventing the creation of side upper floor side openings.

In addition, whilst the extension would project beyond the rear wall of 7 Gough Close, the 2m rear projection is modest and thereby together with the 2m separation gap results in an oblique relationship between windows in the rear elevation of the neighbour and the extension. Given the obliqueness of this relationship the impacts to 7 Gough Close as a result of loss of light and outlook is not considered to be detrimental with the extension only experienced in periphery views from the neighbours rear facing rooms. Furthermore the most affected windows to the rear ground floor of 7 Gough Close serves a non-habitable utility room and then a kitchen which offers shared light to the utility. Whilst impacts to such rooms are still a consideration any apportioned harm is generally less than that which would be apportioned to habitable rooms such as a living room. In any event the impacts to these rooms are not considered to be detrimental to the quality of life of the users.

With regard to the impact to the conservatory of 7 Gough Close; due to the distances (7m) involved between the extension and the side windows of the conservatory any impacts from the proposal towards the conservatory would be limited and would not be much greater than any existing impacts. The amount of enclosure created to the garden associated with 7 Gough Close by the extension would be negligible with the open nature of the rear gardens remaining the dominant character experienced. This type of arrangement is relatively common within areas of housing and allows the provision of modest extensions to meet occupiers changing needs whilst at the same time maintaining good levels of residential amenity for surrounding occupiers. There are no adverse impacts to this neighbour.

It is acknowledged that due to the southern location of the proposal that 7 Gough Close will experience a change in shadowing. Such a change however would be experienced for a very limited part of the day and would not be enduring over the year and thereby is not of such significance to be considered detrimental and thereby would not sustain a reason for refusal on that basis.

The host property would retain sufficient garden space.

As such the proposal is considered to maintain good standard of amenity for all existing occupants of land and buildings and thereby ensures quality of life by not resulting in unacceptable impacts to neighbouring properties. That being the case the proposal accords with Policy 8 (e) of the JCS and therefore is considered to be acceptable in this respect.

4. Impact on highway safety and convenience

Policy 8(b) of the JCS seeks to ensure a satisfactory means of access and provision of parking. The additional habitable accommodation created is not considered to be significant. As such and as there are no changes proposed to the existing parking and access arrangements at the property the proposal would not result in an increased highway safety risk.

5. Response to objector

The objection of the neighbour was based on the impacts of the proposal towards their residential amenity as a result of overshadowing. This impact has been assessed above and predominately because of the modest rear projection of the proposal at approximately 2m the proposal is not considered to cause unacceptable harm to that neighbour or any other neighbour's residential amenity.

Conclusion

In light of the above the proposal is considered to secure a high quality design and a good standard of amenity for all existing occupants of land and buildings. As such and with no other material considerations that would justify coming to a different conclusion the proposal is considered to be in accordance with the Development Plan and consistent with the NPPF and therefore is recommended for approval.

Background Papers	Previous Reports/Minutes	
Title of Document:	Ref:	
Date:	Date:	
Contact Officer:	Sean Bennett, Senior Development Officer on 01536 534316	