B O R O U G H O F K E T T E R I N G

**PLANNING COMMITTEE**

# Meeting held – 5th April 2016

 **Present:** Councillor Shirley Lynch (Chair)

Councillors Linda Adams, Ash Davies, Anne Lee, Mark Rowley, David Soans, Lesley Thurland and Greg Titcombe

**15.PC.73 APOLOGIES**

 Apologies were received from Councillors Cliff Moreton and Keli Watts. It was noted that Councillor Anne Lee was acting as substitute for Councillor Watts.

**15.PC.74 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

 None

**\*15.PC.75 MINUTES**

 **RESOLVED** that the minutes of the meetings of the Planning Committee held on 8th March 2016 be approved as a correct record and signed by the Chair

\***15.PC.76 ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS**

None.

**\*15.PC.77 APPLICATIONS FOR PLANNING PERMISSION**

 The Committee considered the following applications for planning permission which were set out in the Head of Development Control’s Report and which were supplemented verbally and in writing at the meeting. Two speakers attended the meeting and spoke on applications in accordance with the Right to Speak Policy.

 The report included details of applications and, where applicable, results of statutory consultations and representations which had been received from interested bodies and individuals, and the Committee reached the following decisions:-

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Proposed Development5.2\* Full Application: Conversion of church to 2 no. two bedroom flats at Emanuel Evangelical Church, Shaftesbury Street, Kettering for Clifford William Limited Application No: KET/2016/0085Speakers:Dev Rufeea attended the meeting and spoke as a third party against the application. He outlined concerns regarding lack of parking, accessibility and impact on neighbouring amenity.   |  | DecisionThe committee received a report which sought full planning consent for the conversion of an existing building, formerly used as a church, into 2 two-bed flats. An update was provided to the meeting outlining the removal of the Highways Authority (HA) objection based on amendments made to the site access from bell mouth to dropped kerb. The committee noted that within the application site there was an existing conversion of four units. Members considered the layout of the proposal, parking provision and bin storage. The committee heard that alterations would be made to the external appearance of the building to better suit the street scene and a condition was proposed requiring kitchen and dining room windows to be fitted with obscured glass, with top-only opening above 1.7m. In regard to concerns raised regarding a lack of parking in site, it was heard that there was a limited number of spaces available, with 4 spaces for the four existing one bed flats and the proposed dwellings. However, it was considered that there was sufficient street parking available and the town centre was within reasonable walking distance. Members discussed the bin storage in relation to the existing conversion.It was agreed that planning permission be **APPROVED** subject to the following conditions:- |

1. The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of 3 years from the date of this planning permission.

2. The windows in the west elevation of flat 1 shall be glazed with obscured glass (no less than level 4 Pilkington Standard, or equivalent) and any portion of the window that is within 1.7m of the floor of the room where the window is installed shall be non-openable. The window shall thereafter be maintained in that form.

3. No development shall commence on site until details of the materials to be used for hard and paved surfacing have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved surfacing shall be completed before the adjoining buildings are first occupied.

4. Prior to occupation of the development hereby permitted, the vehicular access shall be provided and pedestrian visibility splays of at least 2 metres by 2 metres shall be provided to the side of the vehicular access. The splays shall thereafter be permanently retained and kept free of all obstacles to visibility over 0.6 metres in height above footway level.

5. The parking spaces and refuse storage area hereby approved shall be provided prior to the first occupation of a residential unit and shall be permanently retained and kept available for the parking of vehicles and storage of refuse thereafter.

6. Prior to occupation of a residential unit all garden and landscaped areas shown on the approved plans shall have a capping layer of soil (top and/or sub soils) to a minimum depth of 600mm in private residential gardens and 300mm in general landscaped areas. Prior to occupation a verification report shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority which shall demonstrate that the capping layers have been completed.

7. The development shall not be carried out other than in accordance with the Sustainable Design and Energy Statement - P2 received by the Local Planning Authority on 1st February 2016.

*Members voted on the officers’ recommendation to approve the application*

*(Voting For 7; Against: 0)*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Proposed Development\*5.6 Application for Listed Building Consent: Conversion of ground floor offices to 1 no. one bedroom flat (C3) and 1 no. five bedroom shared residential unit (C4) at 14 Green Lane, Kettering for Mr A Cooke, Red Box Developments. Application No: KET/2016/0133Speakers:Lloyd Girardi attended the meeting and spoke as a third party in favour of the application as the business partner of the applicant. He stated that the application sought to produce high quality, high-end, all-inclusive accommodation for professional workers with a view to accommodating key workers. The proposal adhered to amenity standards and met with the approval of the HMO and fire safety officers. The intention was to bring a listed building back to its former glory and prolong the life of the building as a community asset by undertaking a quality development by a quality developer with a proven track record.  |  | DecisionThe committee received a report which sought permission for listed building consent in relation to Item 5.5.The proposal was for a number of units within the existing building. The site was located near to the Town Centre and as a listed building there were both heritage and planning issues to consider. A similar proposal had previously been presented to Members with that application having been refused on the grounds of lack of amenity space; however this area had now been addressed.The reuse of a listed building was a strong consideration and was actively encouraged by both governmental local planning policies. If approved, stud walling would be installed into the building to comply with fire regulations, however, because of its temporary nature this could easily be reversed if required. There was therefore no harm to the character of internal space. Sufficient bin storage would be provided and this store had been located away from proposed bedrooms, Existing windows would be retained with secondary glazing installed. It was noted that this was a fairly usual approach to dealing with heritage features. Although the main entrance to the building was very close to the road, passing traffic would be of relatively slow speeds. When reusing heritage assets they did not always provide all the elements a new build development could offer, overall it was considered that the application was suitable.It was agreed that the application be **APPROVED** subject to the following conditions: - |

1. The works to which this consent relate shall be begun before the expiration of 3 years from the date of this consent.

2. No works shall take place on site until full details of all wall construction (in cross section) and secondary glazing and their attachment 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.

*Members voted on the officers’ recommendation to approve the application*

 *(Voting, For 7; Against 0)*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Proposed Development\*5.5 Full Application: Conversion of ground floor offices to 1 no. one bedroom flat (C3) and 1 no. five bedroom shared residential unit (C4) at 14 Green Lane, Kettering for Mr A Cooke, Red Box Developments.  Application No. KET/2016/0132Speakers:Speaker as per Item 5.6 above.   |  | DecisionDetail as per Item 5.6 aboveIt was agreed that the application be **APPROVED** subject to the following conditions: - |

1. The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of 3 years from the date of this planning permission.

2. The development hereby permitted shall not be carried out other than in accordance with the approved plans and details submitted with the application.

3. No development shall take place on site until full details of the proposed refuse storage and collection points have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

*Members voted on the officers’ recommendation to approve the application*

 *(Voting, For 7; Against 0)*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Proposed Development\*5.1 Full Application: Raise roof height to form first floor with two storey rear extension at 10 Oakley Road, Pipewell for Mrs L Huxter Application No. KET/2016/0034Speakers:None |  | DecisionThe committee received a report which sought approval for the extension of an existing bungalow to provide a second storey, with a double storey rear extension, demolition of existing garages and construction of a double attached garage with dormer roof.An update was supplied to the meeting that outlined a further letter of objection that had been received in relation to the application. It was noted that the existing building was a post-war bungalow, fronted by a stone wall that replicated the material on the opposite of the road. Because the existing dwelling was low key and single storey, the impact on neighbouring historic buildings was lessened. The combination of historic buildings and areas of open space provided the conservation area which the application site abutted with its character. Members heard that the application site bounded the Pipewell Conservation Area and in planning terms it was important to take into account the character of the wider area as it was very distinctive. Having considered the officer report it was suggested that the proposed design and appearance of the dwelling for which permission was sought did not fit the visual appearance and special nature of the surrounding area. If approved, the proposed dwelling would be a significantly more substantial building than the modest existing bungalow. The proposed additional garage was also quite extensive and would become a dominant element of the development. If the proposal was to be located within an urban area and surrounded by similar properties the application might be considered appropriate, however given the location of the site applied for, it was considered that the design, character and dominance of elements of the application would detract from special character of the area.In relation to the NPPF there was a need to secure high quality design for all future occupiers and in relation to the historic environment, make a positive contribution to the local character. Policy 13 of the CSS stated that developments should respect and enhance the character of their surroundings. Given those policy requirements and the consideration of the application, a more sympathetic design would be more appropriate for the site. The Committee noted there were no other overriding objections of neighbouring amenity or parking.It was agreed that the application be **REFUSED** for the following reasons: - |

The site lies in a visually sensitive rural locality next to the entrance to the Pipewell Conservation Area with The Lodge and boundary wall (to the Listed Pipewell Hall) opposite. The stone boundary wall to the frontage of the application site is also a feature that adds to the distinctive character of the area. The site currently consists of a modest single storey dwelling.

The proposed first floor extension and garage will significantly increase the visual impact of this dwelling within the public realm.  The resultant design in terms of its bulk, form, lack of detailing and fenestration will have a significantly detrimental impact on the street scene and therefore fails to contribute to local character and distinctiveness.

The proposed attached garage by virtue of its height, width, large rear dormer and the resultant variety of ridge lines, clearly visible within the public realm, would present an overly dominant part of the development, which would from the side elevation, as you approach the site, have a detrimental impact on the street scene and are out of character with the existing.

The proposal does not seek to improve the character of the area or demonstrate a high quality design in accordance with the Core Principles or Policies 7 or 12 of the NPPF.  The proposal by failing to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of the area or contribute to local character and distinctiveness with an adverse visual impact on the adjacent Conservation Area and its setting and is therefore contrary to the NPPF and Policy 13 (h and o) of the North Northamptonshire Core Spatial Strategy.

*Members voted to refuse the application*

*(Voting, For 7; Against 0)*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Proposed Development\*5.4 s.73A Retrospective Application: Change of use of former paddock land to domestic garden at Brook House, 36 Main Street, Ashley for Ms P Higgins Application No: KET/2016/0109Speakers:None |  | DecisionThe Committee received a report which sought retrospective approval for change of use from a former paddock to a domestic garden.The meeting noted that the site comprised an existing residential dwelling, a converted barn and new garage and a work shop. The land change of use applied for was formerly a paddock but had been landscaped and mowed and was being utilised as a garden for the residence. This had come to light during the planning permission process for the workshop and an invitation had been extended to apply for retrospective planning permission for change of use. To prevent the visual nature of the site from being impacted in a future by built development, a condition was proposed removing permitted development rights other than landscaping or tree work. Any boundary treatment would also require consent. It was noted that there was no significant impact on neighbouring amenity and the proposal was not out of character with the surrounding area.It was agreed that the application be **APPROVED** subject to the following conditions: - |

1. Notwithstanding the provisions of Article 3 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (or any Order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification) no development permitted by Schedule 2, Part 1 Classes E (outbuildings) or F (hard surfaces) or Part 2 Classes A (gates, walls and fences) and B (means of access to a highway) unless consent has first been granted in the form of a separate planning application.

*Members voted on the officers’ recommendation to approve the application*

*(Voting, For 7; Against 0)*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Proposed Development\*5.3 Full Application: Single and two storey rear extensions, garage conversion and construction of detatched garage at 4 Reynolds Close, Kettering for Mr C Rogers.Application No: KET/2016/0105Speakers:None |  | DecisionThis item was withdrawn from the agenda prior to the meeting to be decided under delegated powers.  |

*\*(The Committee exercised its delegated powers to*

*act in the matters marked \*)*

*(The meeting started at 7.00pm and ended at 7:55pm)*

Signed: ..........................................................

Chair

*DJP*