

## BOROUGH OF KETTERING

<b>Committee</b>	<b>Full Planning Committee - 23/09/2014</b>	<b>Item No: 5.6</b>
<b>Report Originator</b>	<b>Trevor Feary Development Officer</b>	<b>Application No: KET/2014/0403</b>
<b>Wards Affected</b>	<b>St. Michaels and Wicksteed</b>	
<b>Location</b>	<b>22 Edward Road, Kettering</b>	
<b>Proposal</b>	<b>s.73A Retrospective Application: Single storey rear extension</b>	
<b>Applicant</b>	<b>Mr D Neil</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 with Policy 13 of the North Northamptonshire Core Spatial Strategy.

## **Officers Report for KET/2014/0403**

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

### **3.0 Information**

#### **Relevant Planning History**

KET/1991/0585 - Rear Extension. Granted 23/09/1991

KET/2005/0892 - Rear Extension (conservatory). Granted 08/11/2005

#### **Site Description**

Officer's site inspection was carried out on 20/08/2014

The Application dwelling lies to the North of Edward Road at a point where there are a series of virtually identical in appearance and layout semi-detached properties. These are all single storey at present but do incorporate high hipped pitched roofs. Similar style dwellings continue around the "square" being around Thomas Road and Martin Road to the rear of the Application Site.

Number 22, the Application dwelling, is the left-hand half of the pair of dwellings with number 20. These are constructed of a red brick with small reddish brown roof tiles. Close boarded fencing of around 1.2 metres height divides the garden areas of the two dwellings. Boundary treatment to the remaining 2 rear boundaries is 1.8 metre high close boarded fencing.

#### **Proposed Development**

The proposal is to remove the existing conservatory and to build a slightly larger brick addition to "square off" with the existing brick built extension. A new pitched roof is to be constructed encompassing the two additions and within which will be incorporated an attic store (with three rooflights)

#### **Any Constraints Affecting The Site**

Nene Valley NIA Boundary

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

#### **Neighbours**

##### **Number 20**

No permission was given before works were carried out. Side wall has been erected directly on boundary leaving no room for the over hanging soffit and guttering (approx. 300mm). Window with opening sashes also looks directly into bedroom and kitchen windows resulting in loss of privacy. Size of extension has removed a deal of natural light and is overwhelming.

##### **Number 24**

Building works carried out to date are clearly intended to provide further accommodation at first floor level. Two of the windows inserted at first

floor level overlook garden leading to loss of privacy. None opening windows with obscure glazing would be a simple and acceptable solution. Concern expressed at capability of existing surface water drainage system to cope with additional run-off (has experienced flooding from overflowing). Concerned that increased occupancy will add to potential for foul sewer to overflow again (as it has in the past into garden). Concerned about a possibility of an increase in road traffic due to increased occupancy.

## **5.0 Planning Policy**

### **National Planning Policy Framework**

#### **Development Plan Policies**

#### **North Northamptonshire Core Spatial Strategy**

Para 17 - Core Planning Principles

Section 6 - Delivering a wide choice of quality homes

Section 7 - Requiring good design

#### **Local Plan**

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 extending the property
2. Location and appearance of the proposal
3. Impact upon the amenities of occupiers of neighbouring property
4. Other issues raised in representations received.

### **1. Principle of extending the property**

The application site is in an established residential area within the designated boundary of Kettering and as such the principle of extending existing dwellings is acceptable. The proposal itself will only remove a small area of hardened outside area and in the main the occupants private amenity area (garden) will remain, and will remain of an acceptable size relative to the dwelling's size.

### **2. Location and appearance of the proposal**

The proposed addition is wholly to the rear of the Application dwelling and will not be viewed from Edwards Road due to the close proximity of the existing dwellings to one another. The proposed addition will only, therefore, be seen from within the gardens of property in Edwards Road

and the gardens of property in Martin Road upon which the Application site backs onto. Notwithstanding these limited viewpoints the proposed extension's appearance will harmonise well with the existing dwelling, both in design and materials used terms, and is considered acceptable (meeting the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework and Policy 13 (h) of the Core Spatial Strategy).

### 3. Impact upon the amenities of occupiers of neighbouring property

The proposed extension is very close to the mutual boundary with number 20 Edward Road. As such Officers did have concerns regarding the window which had been inserted in the Eastern side wall of the extension (as also raised by the neighbour) due overlooking into the adjoining site – it does not look directly into the neighbours windows as claimed. Following negotiations the Applicant has agreed to change this window to a high level window only and which will allow light in but no direct looking out into the neighbouring property.

The addition of the roof could remove an element of late evening sun and cause some additional overshadowing to parts of number 20. but this will be insignificant over the existing situation where most of this is lost in any event. Other parts of the neighbouring dwelling and its whole garden area will remain unaffected. A slight “tunnel” effect will be created between the proposed extension and the neighbour's own rear projection but the separation distance between the two will be sufficient to negate this. The proposed extension's proximity to the mutual boundary has the potential to create a dominating feel but because of the wall's single storey height and the fact the roof is sloping away from the neighbouring property this is deemed to be at an acceptable level. There are virtually identical extensions already constructed in the vicinity of the Application site.

There is no loss of sunlight, overshadowing or domination caused to number 24. Clarification as to the intended use of the first floor is presently being sought but from the dimensions of the room being created this could easily be used as a bedroom. However, the roof lights being proposed here are all quite narrow restricting view out from them. As happens with most first floor windows, and a large proportion of the surrounding dwellings do display roof lights, they will permit some overlooking of other property. In this case of number 24 it is not the area of garden to the immediate rear of the dwelling but more towards the rear end of the garden. This level of overlooking is considered acceptable. The proposed roof lights will actually look directly into the rear of gardens in Martin Road but because of the distances involved this is considered to be acceptable.

Accordingly, the submission is considered to comply with Policy 13 (l) of the Core Spatial Strategy and paragraph 17 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

#### 4. Other issues raised in representations received

The Applicants have confirmed that all works carried out have taken place on their land and this includes the soffits etc. This is really a private issue which will need clarifying/sorting between the parties involved. The issue regarding surface water drainage is for dealing with under the Building Regulations. The issue of the foul water sewer potentially overflowing is again a private matter and the appropriate Authority.

The Application site presently provides 2 off road parking spaces and would be capable of providing 1 further. Even so the existing level of parking is considered to be appropriate for the size of dwelling, even in its intended extended form (conforming with Policy 13 of the Core Spatial Strategy).

#### **Conclusion**

Once the scheme has been amended as outlined above it will be in keeping with the character of the area and raise no unacceptable adverse implications for residential amenity or highway safety. The application is therefore in accordance with Policies 13 of the Core Spatial Strategy and Section 7 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

#### **Background Papers**

Title of Document:

Date:

Contact Officer:

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

Ref:

Date:

Trevor Feary, Development Officer on 01536 534316