#### **BOROUGH OF KETTERING**

Committee	Full Planning Committee - 11/09/2012	Item No: 5.4
Report	Chris Rose	Application No:
Originator	Development Officer	KET/2012/0438
Wards	Avondale Grange	
Affected	_	
Location	17 Cedar Road, Kettering	
Proposal	Full Application: Two storey and single storey side extension	
Applicant	Mr A Hollis	

### 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 1st floor window on the north elevation of the extension hereby permitted shall be glazed with obscured glass and thereafter shall be permanently retained in that form.

REASON: To protect the privacy of the adjoining property and to prevent overlooking in accordance with Policy 13 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 of the North Northamptonshire Core Spatial Strategy.

4. 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 west or north elevations or roof planes of the extension.

REASON: To protect the amenity and privacy of the occupiers of adjoining property in

accordance with Policy 13 of the North Northamptonshire Core Spatial Strategy.

5. The development hereby permitted shall not be carried out other than in accordance with the amended plans 'Proposed Ground Floor Plan' received by the Local Planning Authority 21st August 2012, 'Proposed First Floor Plan' received by the Local Planning Authority 4th July 2012 and 'Proposed Elevations' received by the Local Planning Authority 6th July 2012.

REASON: To define the planning permission and to secure a satisfactory form of development in accordance with policy 13 of the North Northamptonshire Core Spatial Strategy.

# Notes (if any) :-

• This planning permission is subject to "pre-commencement" conditions which require details/drawings to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before ANY development may lawfully commence. Any development commenced in breach of these "pre-commencement" conditions will be unauthorised, a breach of planning control, and liable to immediate Enforcement and Stop Notice action.

# <u>Justification for Granting Planning Permission</u>

The proposal is in accordance with national and local policies as set out in Paragraph 17 and Section 7 of the National Planning Policy Framework, Policies 2 and 3 of The East Midlands Regional Plan and Policies 1, 9 and 13 of the North Northamptonshire Core Spatial Strategy. There are no material considerations that indicate against the proposal.

### **Officers Report**

# 3.0 Information

# **Relevant Planning History**

None

### **Site Description**

Officer's site inspection was carried out on 19/07/2012. The site contains a semi-detached dwelling and its curtilage in an established residential area. The dwelling is a 2 storey brick-built structure with a hipped roof. The house has a simple, functional architectural style typical of housing estates built in the 1960s. The character of the surrounding area is similar to this style, and contains a mixture of semi-detached and terraced dwellings with varied appearances and architectural treatments.

The dwelling has a small front garden which faces south, an area of hardstanding to the west and a roughly triangular shaped rear garden. Car parking is provided in on-street bays.

### **Proposed Development**

Two storey and single storey side extension.

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

None.

# 4.0 Consultation and Customer Impact

#### **Neighbours**

Two representations received. Objections raised in relation to:

- Loss of light to the front and rear of no. 15 Cedar Road
- The extension will be too close to no. 15 Cedar Road
- The extension will result in more residents / visitors and increased take up of car parking spaces (x2)
- The building will look out of place and be an eyesore

### 5.0 Planning Policy

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

Paragraph 17 – Core planning principles Section 7 – Requiring good design

#### **East Midlands Regional Plan**

Policy 2 - Promoting Better Design

Policy 3 - Distribution of new development

#### North Northamptonshire Core Spatial Strategy

Policy 1 - Strengthening the network of settlements

Policy 9 - Distribution and location of development

Policy 13 - General Sustainable Development Principles

#### Local Plan

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. Principle of Development
- 2. Impact on Residential Amenity
- 3. Design, character and appearance
- 4. Parking provision

### 1. Principle of Development

The application site is within the town boundary of Kettering, as defined by Policy 35 of the Local Plan, in an established residential area. Policy 1 and 9 of the Core Spatial Strategy direct development to existing urban areas. The proposal is for an extension of an existing dwelling within its curtilage which is surrounded by similar residential units. As such, the principle of such householder development in this area is established.

#### 2. Impact on Residential Amenity

Paragraph 17 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that development must secure a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings. Policy 13 of the North Northamptonshire Core Spatial Strategy is supportive of householder development provided the proposals do not result in an unacceptable impact on the amenities of neighbouring properties, by reason of noise, vibration, pollution, loss of light or overlooking.

Because the extension would be located on the west elevation of the dwelling, the neighbouring property in this direction (no. 15 Cedar Road) the impact on this property has been considered. The site lies in a reasonably high density residential estate where dwellings are laid out in close proximity to one another with generally modest sized curtilages and gaps between buildings.

In terms of overbearing impact and loss of light; the proposal retains a gap of 0.5m from the boundary of the site and no. 15 Cedar Road would be separated from the proposed extension at an angle of 45° by a distance of some 5m to the front (where the 2 storey element is proposed) and 3.5m at the rear, where the extension is stepped down to a single storey. The design mitigates the impacts by stepping down and hipping the roof, stepping down to a single storey where the separation distances are smallest and tapering in with the line of the plot to be narrower at the rear. These separation distances and the design of the extension are such that it is not considered that there would be an overbearing impact on the amenity of no. 15 Cedar Road.

Because the extension would be to the south-east of no. 15, there would be a

degree of loss of light resulting from the 2 storey element of the extension to the east elevation of the neighbouring property. The east elevation of no. 15 features a door and window at ground floor and an obscure glazed window to the 1st floor (suggesting that this is not a habitable room). The aspects discussed above (separation distances and design mitigation) are such that this is not considered to be an unacceptable impact and sufficient light would still be received to the side garden, rear garden and side elevation including the 1st floor obscure-glazed window of the neighbouring dwelling.

In terms of overlooking, no windows are proposed on the west elevation of the proposed extension, so no overlooking from this elevation would ensue. A condition could ensure that this remains so in perpetuity. A small window is proposed on the rear (north) elevation which would be a landing window. A condition could secure that this should be obscure-glazed so as not to introduce the potential for overlooking to the rear garden of no. 15 Cedar Road.

To the rear the extension would be separated from the closest neighbouring dwelling to the north (no. 84 Orchard Crescent) by a distance of over 18m at an obtuse angle of 60°. There would, therefore be no detrimental impact on neighbouring properties in this direction.

In summary, with the imposition of suitable conditions, there would be no unacceptable detrimental impact on the amenity of neighbouring properties and the amenity implications of the proposal would not be out of context with the character of the area. The proposal is, therefore, in accordance with Policy 13 part L of the Core Spatial Strategy.

#### 3. Design, character and appearance

Section 7 of the National Planning Policy Framework and Policy 2 of the East Midlands Regional Plan require new development to provide a good standard of design. Policy 13 of the CSS requires new development to be of a high standard of design and to respect the character of its surroundings.

The proposed design involves a new structure on the west elevation of the dwelling comprising a 2 storey element facing the front (south) which is stepped down to a single storey extension to the rear. The design has been chosen to match the existing dwelling and involves a hipped roof which is stepped down from the existing roofline, which would mean the proposal would read as a distinct extension to the original. The front (south) building line of the extension matches the existing and extends to the side (west) elevation by 3.4m. The proposal would alter the appearance of the house as a distinct and symmetrical semi-detached dwelling. However, it is not considered that the dwelling is of sufficiently distinctive character for this to be a sustainable reason for refusal. Moreover, the character of the area is very much a mixed bag in terms of dwelling size, mass and architectural styles. There are frequent examples in the vicinity of terraced runs of dwellings which have a larger mass than the proposed. Immediately to the west there exists a larger mass semidetached pair of dwellings of very different design - hipped structures with prominent tiled cladding to the 1st floor. It is not considered that the proposal would result in a building incongruous to this context.

The scale and mass of the proposal is considered to be reasonable and appropriate to the plot and a distance of 0.5m will be retained to the western boundary of the site. The extension could be stepped back from the built line at the front of the dwelling which would further make it read as subordinate to the original. However, the internal layout and location of the staircase is such that the proposed built extent is required in order to enable an internal access door to the extension. In this instance to insist on a set-back would be unreasonable and reduce the practicality of the extended space. Additionally, the applicant has indicated that the new bricks will be tied-in to the existing dwelling on the front elevation (existing half-bricks removed and in-filled with the new courses) which will give a good quality finish and appearance to the front. This would not be possible with a set-back.

Materials are proposed to match the existing dwelling, primarily the red facing brick of the existing house, and this could be secured by condition. Given the prominence of the front elevation in the street scene, and the fact it will be tied into the brick courses of the existing dwelling, materials samples are recommended to be secured by condition.

Overall, the design is acceptable and the proposal accords with East Midlands Regional Plan Policy 2 and criteria H of Policy 13 of the Core Spatial Strategy.

#### 4. Parking provision

Representations were made stating that the extension would result in more residents / visitors and increased take up of car parking spaces. Car parking is provided in dedicated off-street parking bays. It is not considered that the addition of a 3rd bedroom to the 2 bedroom dwelling would be an unreasonable intensification of the use of the site and there exists in the vicinity a number of dwellings larger than the existing. There is no evidence to suggest the addition of a bedroom and extra living space would result in an increased number of additional vehicle movements or parking requirements. In any case on both occasions that I visited the site there was ample car parking spaces available on Cedar Road in the dedicated off-street bays.

### Conclusion

The proposed extension is in accordance with the relevant policies of the Development Plan and there are no material considerations which indicate planning permission should not be granted. The principle of development is established, there would be no unacceptable detrimental impact on neighbouring residential amenity and the design is acceptable. The application is recommended for approval, subject to conditions.

Background Papers

**Previous Reports/Minutes** 

Title of Document: Ref: Date: Date:

Contact Officer: Chris Rose, Development Officer on 01536 534316

### **SITE LOCATION PLAN**

17 Cedar Road, Kettering Application No.: KET/2012/0438



