

## BOROUGH OF KETTERING

<b>Committee</b>	<b>Full Planning Committee - 09/02/2016</b>	<b>Item No: 5.6</b>
<b>Report Originator</b>	<b>Andrew Smith Senior Development Officer</b>	<b>Application No: KET/2015/1016</b>
<b>Wards Affected</b>	<b>Desborough St. Giles</b>	
<b>Location</b>	<b>30 Millholm Road, Desborough</b>	
<b>Proposal</b>	<b>Full Application: First floor rear extension</b>	
<b>Applicant</b>	<b>Mr &amp; Mrs T Dennett</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 development hereby permitted shall not be carried out other than in accordance with the approved plans and details referenced as follows: 15/033.1; 15/033.3; 15/033.4.

REASON: In the interest of securing an appropriate form of development in accordance with Policy 13 of the North Northamptonshire Core Spatial 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 building.

REASON: In the interests of visual amenity in accordance with Policy 13 of the North Northamptonshire Core Spatial Strategy.

## **Officers Report for KET/2015/1016**

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

### **3.0 Information**

#### **Relevant Planning History**

*KET/1986/1046* Front extension to kitchen and hall (Approved subject to conditions).

#### **Site Description**

Officer's site inspection was carried out on 12/01/2016.

The site constitutes a 2no. storey, red brick, link-detached residential property located within a residential area of Desborough. The property is served by front and rear amenity areas.

#### **Proposed Development**

It is proposed that the property be extended at first floor level to the rear. This would provide an extension to one of the property's bedrooms and would replace an existing first floor 'sunroom' that would be removed as part of the proposals.

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

None.

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

**Desborough Town Council:** No objection.

**Neighbours:** Notification letters were sent out to close proximity neighbours, 1no. response was received and can be summarised as follows:

*32 Millholm Road:* Objection. A significant level of sunlight and daylight would be lost due to the proximity of the extension. The extension would provide an even greater sense of enclosure. There would be windows positioned very close to No.32 so as to lead to overlooking and loss of privacy – particularly when the landing window is left open.

### **5.0 Planning Policy**

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

Policy 7. Requiring good design

#### **Development Plan Policies**

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

Policy 1. Strengthening the Network of Settlements

Policy 13. General Sustainable Development Principles

#### **Local Plan**

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. Design & Visual Appearance
3. Residential Amenity
4. Highways

### 1. Principle of Development

The scheme would provide an extension to an existing residential premise located within the town boundary of Rothwell. The scheme would therefore strengthen the network of settlements within the Borough in compliance with Policy 1 of the Core Spatial Strategy; the principle of development is considered to be acceptable.

### 2. Design & Visual Appearance

It is considered that the proposed extension would be designed appropriately so as to suitably reflect the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area in compliance with Policy 13 (h) of the Core Spatial Strategy. The extension would correspond with the building lines exhibited at ground floor level immediately below whilst the dual-pitched roof that is proposed would replicate the style of the roof that serves the main body of the property. Its ridge would be set beneath the full ridge height of the property, allowing the extension to appear subservient to the main dwelling whilst tying in at eaves level. In the interests of visual amenity a planning condition should be added to any permission requiring external facing materials to match existing.

### 3. Residential Amenity

The neighbouring occupier to the east of the site (No. 32 Millholm Road) has objected to the application on the basis of loss of amenity through loss of sunlight/daylight, a greater sense of enclosure (i.e. an overbearing relationship) and loss of privacy through overlooking. These concerns relate to a west-facing first-floor landing window that serves No. 32 and faces over the application site; the window is openable and obscure-glazed. It is the only window opening that serves the western side elevation of No.32.

The extension would be located in close proximity to the aforementioned landing window, but it would not extend immediately in front of the window. The rear building line, which is already exhibited at ground floor level below, is set to the north of the landing window. The extension would not unduly impact upon the amount of light that would be able to reach the window, particularly given the orientation of the site whereby the extension would be set to the north-west of the landing window (meaning that the extension would have very limited potential to interfere with the path of sunlight to this opening).

The extension would be set 1m away from (and directly opposite to) the western flank wall of No.32 (which is blank with the exception of the aforementioned obscure-glazed landing window). It is not considered that the extension would be overbearing upon No.32 so as to adversely affect the amenity of occupiers, particularly when considering the limited scale of the proposed work.

A single south-facing opening would be provided to the rear elevation of the extension; this would be set at a 90 degree angle to the landing window of No.32 and would be set on an alignment close to the northern edge of the landing window. The views that would be provided from the newly proposed opening to the landing window of No.32 would therefore be oblique and non-obtrusive. In any event, the landing window does not serve a habitable room and is obscure glazed. As a further note the current 'sunroom' (to be replaced by the extension) is setback slightly to the north when compared to where the first floor extension would be sited and therefore currently offers greater opportunities to view inside the landing window when it is in its opened state.

Two new window openings are proposed in total – one rear-facing (south-facing) and one side-facing (west-facing). They would not create views that are not already available from within the property's 'sunroom' and would not therefore hold the potential to adversely affect the amenities of neighbouring occupiers. It is noted that the proposed west-facing opening would be set approximately 80cm closer to the western boundary of the site when compared to the alignment of the west-facing side of the current 'sunroom', but it would still be set some 3m back from the western boundary of the site and does not raise concerns in the context of creating sensitive overlooking opportunities.

The proposals would not result in an unacceptable impact upon the amenities of neighbouring residential occupiers or the wider area in compliance with Policy 13 (l) of the Core Spatial Strategy.

#### 4. Highways

No alterations are proposed to existing access or car parking arrangements at the property. The scheme would not therefore prejudice highway safety in compliance with Policy 13 (n) of the Core Spatial Strategy.

#### Conclusion

The proposed development would respect the character and appearance of its surroundings and would safeguard surrounding residential amenity in compliance with Policy 13 of the North Northamptonshire Core Spatial Strategy and the guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Framework.

#### **Background Papers**

Title of Document:

Date:

Contact Officer:

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

Ref:

Date:

Andrew Smith, Senior Development Officer on 01536 534316