

## BOROUGH OF KETTERING

<b>Committee</b>	<b>Full Planning Committee - 22/08/2017</b>	<b>Item No: 5.12</b>
<b>Report Originator</b>	<b>Sean Bennett Senior Development Officer</b>	<b>Application No: KET/2017/0501</b>
<b>Wards Affected</b>	<b>St. Michaels and Wicksteed</b>	
<b>Location</b>	<b>2 Springfield Road, Kettering</b>	
<b>Proposal</b>	<b>Full Application: Two storey side extension</b>	
<b>Applicant</b>	<b>Mr M Short</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 detailed below.

REASON: In the interest of securing an appropriate form of development in accordance with Policy 8 of the North Northamptonshire Joint Core 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 and shall match the eaves and window architectural detailing and Flemish bond brickwork evident on the existing building.

REASON: In the interests of visual amenity in accordance Policy 8 of the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy.

4. 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 additional openings permitted by Schedule 2, Part 1 Classes A or C shall be made in any upper floor elevation or roof plane of the extension.

REASON: To protect the amenity and privacy of the occupiers of adjoining property in accordance with Policy 8 of the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy.

## **Officers Report for KET/2017/0501**

This application is reported for Committee decision because there is an unresolved, material objection to the proposal

### **3.0 Information**

#### **Relevant Planning History**

None

#### **Site Visit**

Officer's site inspection was carried out on 07/07/2017 and 04/08/2017

#### **Site Description**

The site comprises an end of terrace dwelling located in an established residential area with open space to the rear

#### **Proposed Development**

The application seeks full planning permission for a two storey side extension and consists of an under croft to the ground floor with a bedroom above

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

None

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

**Neighbours:** Two third party *objection* letters received from 16 Springfield Close on the basis of the proposal resulting in a detrimental impact to the light into their kitchen window which has been enjoyed for 46 years and impact the surrounding areas visual amenity

### **5.0 Planning Policy**

#### **National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF):**

Core principles and Chapter 7 (Requiring good design)

#### **Development Plan Policies**

#### **North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy (JCS):**

Policy 8: Place shaping

#### **Saved Policies in the Local Plan (LP) for Kettering Borough:**

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. Impact on the character and appearance of the area
2. Impact on residential amenity
3. Impact on highway safety and convenience
4. Response to objector

### 1. Impact on the character and appearance of the area

Policy 8 (d) of the JCS seeks development to respond to local character, which is in accordance with Chapter 7 of the NPPF in requiring good design.

The pleasing character of the area is derived from the set-back of the dwellings from the highway edge to give spaciousness together with the symmetry of the terraces. The Flemish bond to the brickwork, the provision of chimneys together with door, window and eaves architectural detailing to the host terrace and the use of render to the facia on nearby dwellings add interest to the locality.

For the most part the terraces in the area appear as built. Whilst the proposal would unbalance the strict symmetry of the terrace; in light of the subordinate nature of the proposal, which includes a frontage set-back the overall impression of symmetry and critically the legibility of the terrace is retained in the street scape. This also means that any mis-matching of materials is less noticeable and because of the sites location on a corner with Springfield Close and difference in land levels there is no prospect of creating a longer terrace with the adjacent row. The materials and the bonding of the brickwork will be conditioned to match the existing. As such the proposal is considered to respect the character and appearance of the area and therefore acceptable in this regard.

### 2. Impact on residential amenity

Policy 8 (e) of the JCS seeks to protect amenity, which is derived from the core principles of the NPPF, which amongst other things aims to secure a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings.

Due to the location of the proposed extension the development would only have an impact to the adjacent occupiers at 16 Springfield Close. Notably the slab level to that property is approximately 1.5m higher than the levels of the application site. There is no loss of privacy issues as the only window proposed in the extension faces the street. Any prospect of further openings being created in the future will be controlled by condition.

In terms of other residential amenity impacts; there is one opening in the facing side elevation of 16 Springfield Close at ground floor level and serving a kitchen, which due to the difference in land levels is level with the first floor of the development property. This window would experience a change in its outlook. The circumstances of that affected window are as follows:

- Serves a room solely used as a kitchen and thereby is not considered to be a habitable room
- The proposed extension is north-east of the affected window and therefore will not interrupt the arc of the sun which travels east to west via the south and therefore no loss of sun-light will be experienced
- Double aspect with a partially glazed door also serving the room facing the rear/south and shared light from an adjacent dining area
- The window is located in the side elevation where generally impacts on windows are more common and tolerated
- Currently has impact from the existing host property particularly when stood face on to the window within the room

For these reasons whilst an impact to the neighbours kitchen window is acknowledged because of the mitigating points listed this impact is not considered to be so injurious to the residential amenity of the affected room and therefore the quality of life experienced by its residents to be considered detrimental. Thereby refusal on this matter is not justified and thus the proposal is considered to be acceptable in this respect.

### 3. Impact on highway safety and convenience

Policy 8(b) of the JCS seeks to ensure a satisfactory means of access and provision of parking. The additional habitable accommodation created is not considered to be significant. As such and as there are no changes proposed to the existing parking and access arrangements at the property the proposal would not result in an increased highway safety risk.

### 4. Response to objector

The objector primarily is concerned by the impact of the proposal to their facing ground floor kitchen window. This matter is discussed above and whilst an impact is acknowledged because of the nature of that window, the characteristics of the room it serves and notably its orientation to the extension the impact is not determinative. Their other concern with regard the impact of the proposal to the character and appearance has also been discussed above.

As the proposal has been found to be acceptable on both these points the development complies with Development Plan policies and as such, notwithstanding the objection, planning permission should not be precluded for these reasons.

### Conclusion

In light of the above and with no other material considerations or provision of demonstrable evidence that would justify coming to a different conclusion the proposal is considered to be in accordance with the Development Plan and the NPPF and therefore is recommended for approval.

Title of Document:

Ref:

Date:

Date:

Contact Officer:

Sean Bennett, Senior Development Officer on 01536 534316