

BOROUGH OF KETTERING

Committee	Full Planning Committee - 06/09/2016	Item No: 5.4
Report Originator	Pritesh Shah Senior Development Officer	Application No: KET/2016/0501
Wards Affected	Rothwell	
Location	23 Columbus Crescent, Rothwell	
Proposal	Full Application: Two storey side extension and single storey front extension with new conservatory roof	
Applicant	Mr K Beattie	

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

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 for the external walls and roof and doors and windows of the development hereby permitted shall match in terms of colour, type and texture those used on the existing building.

REASON: To ensure that the development is constructed and finished in materials which are in harmony with the materials used on the existing building and to comply with Policy 8 of the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy and the NPPF especially paragraph 56 and 60.

Officers Report for KET/2016/0501

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

3.0 Information

Relevant Planning History

- KET/2014/0483 – Two storey side extension, single storey front extension and new roof to rear conservatory and alteration to elevation. Refused on design grounds as the first floor extension was not a subservient addition to the existing building. This application was subsequently appealed by the applicant and the Inspector sought to approve the front lean-to extension and the rear extension but refused the first floor extension element of the proposal.

Site Description

Officer's site inspection was carried out on 27 July 2016.

23 Columbus Crescent is a semi-detached residential property located within a relatively large estate development dating back to the late 1970's. The property has a detached flat roofed single garage to the side. The neighbouring property to the north sits on slightly higher ground and the adjoining semi to the south is notable for a two storey side extension which is both set back from the front elevation of the property and has a lower ridge height identifying it as an extension to the original dwellinghouse.

To the rear is an existing single storey conservatory which runs the full width of the property.

Proposed Development

The proposal is in three parts: adapt the existing rear conservatory by reducing the amount of glazing at its northern end and constructing a new mono pitched lean-to roof over it; erect a first floor extension over the existing flat roof garage extending the full depth of the house and extending up to the boundary with the neighbouring property and thirdly erect a front extension 1.8m deep with a mono pitched roof over extending along the whole of the extended width of the dwelling.

Any Constraints Affecting the Site

None.

4.0 Consultation and Customer Impact

Rothwell Parish Council: Object as the proposal is considered to be over development and would have an adverse impact on neighbouring property.

Neighbours: An objection has been received from neighbouring 21 Columbus Crescent who has an adjoining garage to the application site. The objection is based on the proposal being built to the current common boundary which would cause a terracing effect if they also propose the same extension and this would not be in-

keeping with the character of the area which comprises of detached and semi-detached dwellings.

5.0 Planning Policy

National Planning Policy Framework

Section 7 'Requiring good design'

Development Plan Policies

North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy

Policy 8 (d) and (e).

6.0 Financial/Resource Implications

None

7.0 Planning Considerations

The key issues for consideration in this application are:-

1. Design
2. Residential amenity
3. Parking

1. Design

Paragraph 56 of the NPPF states:

The Government attaches great importance to the design of the built environment. Good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, is indivisible from good planning, and should contribute positively to making places better for people.

Paragraph 60 of the NPPF states:

Planning policies and decisions should not attempt to impose architectural styles or particular tastes and they should not stifle innovation, originality or initiative through unsubstantiated requirements to conform to certain development forms or styles. It is, however, proper to seek to promote or reinforce local distinctiveness.

The need to respond to local character is also highlighted within Policy 8 (d) of the JCS.

The front extension at 1.8m deep is modest, albeit it will run along the whole of the proposed new front elevation. It will have a mono pitched roof to match that of the existing dwelling and the materials to be used are to match the existing. The front garden of the dwelling is relatively deep and hence the extension will not appear intrusive in the street scene and this element of the proposal is considered acceptable in design terms, which has also been approved by an Inspector at a recent appeal decision.

With respect to the design of the proposed alterations to the rear conservatory, it is considered that the proposal is relatively minor in nature. The proposal will not add any further floor space to the existing structure and is considered to enhance the appearance of the existing structure. A recent appeal decision has also considered this element of the proposal to be acceptable.

In assessing the design of the proposed extension over the existing garage it is noted there is an existing two storey side extension on the adjoining semi-detached property which is set back slightly from the front elevation of the original dwelling which additionally has the effect of creating a break in the roof plane. The overall impact is that the extension is recognised as such and is perceived as being subservient to the original dwelling.

Within the previously refused scheme (KET/2014/0483), the applicant was advised to set the extension over the garage slightly back from the principal elevation and also reduce the ridge height in order to create a sense of subservience to the proposed extension. This has been taken into account by the applicant as the first floor extension is now stepped in from the principal elevation by 300mm and the ridge height of the extension is also approximately 300mm below the ridge of the original dwelling.

The first floor extension is built to the common boundary of the property which has raised an objection from the neighbouring property that if they were to do the same extension then a terracing effect will be created which will detract away from the character of the area which mainly comprises of detached and semi-detached dwellings. Whilst there are some terrace properties in the wider estate, the application to hand does not include a side extension to the neighbouring property and we do not have any evidence of an application for a side extension to the neighbouring property. As such the application needs to be determined on its own merits.

If an application for a side extension to the neighbouring property (21 Columbus Crescent) was to be received, it is not considered that a terracing effect will be observed if the neighbouring dwelling also constructs a similar extension to the common boundary. This is because the first floor extension is set back from the principal elevation and set down from the ridge height which will mitigate against any terracing effect that may be caused.

Each element of the proposal is not considered to detract away from the character and scale of the existing dwelling or the surrounding area and is in accordance with 8 (d) of the JCS and the NPPF.

2. Residential amenity

There will be no adverse impact on the amenity of the adjoining semi-detached property resulting from the alterations to the rear conservatory. The depth of the existing conservatory remains the same. There will be a modest increase in the height of the roof as a result of the proposed mono pitched construction but this will neither be overbearing nor cause any undue overshadowing, being on the north side of the adjoining semi.

Similarly with the front extension, whilst this will also sit on the boundary with the adjoining semi it will again not give rise to any over shadowing and at 1.8m deep not have an overbearing impact on the neighbouring ground floor habitable room window.

Having regard to the two storey side extension an objection was previously raised from the neighbouring (21 Columbus Crescent). The objection was based on the overbearing scale of the proposed development and overshadowing that would be caused.

The previously refused scheme did not consider there to be any adverse impact on neighbouring residential amenity and therefore the scale of the current proposal which sees a slight reduction in height of the first floor extension is also not considered to have any adverse impact on neighbouring occupiers.

The proposal is therefore considered to be compliant with Policy 8 (e) of the JCS.

3. Parking

The proposals include the retention of an integral single garage that would be served by the property's front driveway. Access arrangements would remain the same on-site. The proposals would not prejudice highway safety in compliance with Policy 8 (b) of the JCS.

Conclusion

The proposed development creates a subservient extension that is in-keeping with the character of the existing dwelling and does not detract away from the character and scale of the existing dwelling and surrounding area. The scale of the proposed development is not considered to cause adverse impact on neighbouring residential amenity by way of overshadowing and a loss of privacy from overlooking. The proposed development is therefore in compliance with Policy 8 (d) and (e) of the JCS and the NPPF especially paragraph 56 and 60.

Background Papers

Title of Document:

Date:

Contact Officer:

Previous Reports/Minutes

Ref:

Date:

Pritesh Shah, Senior Development Officer on 01536 534316