

BOROUGH OF KETTERING

Committee	Full Planning Committee - 11/04/2018	Item No: 5.4
Report Originator	Ruth James Assistant Development Officer	Application No: KET/2018/0044
Wards Affected	All Saints	
Location	1 Kingsley Avenue, Kettering	
Proposal	Full Application: Porch to side, two storey side and rear extensions. Juliet balcony to rear. 3 no. windows to west elevation	
Applicant	Mr A Gandham	

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 listed 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.

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 the western side elevation or roof plane of the building.

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/2018/0044

This application is reported for Committee decision because are unresolved material objections to the proposals.

3.0 Information

Relevant Planning History

None

Site Visit

Officer's site inspection was carried out on 12/02/2018

Site Description

The application site lies within the town boundary to the northeast of Kettering within an established residential area. Ancient mapping shows that Kingsley Avenue along with the parallel residential roads of Blandford and Neale Avenue were developed during the first half of the 20th century. These roads run in a northeast direction from Rockingham Road for a distance of over 800 metres. Within the immediate vicinity of the application site the properties are large, two-storey and mostly semi-detached, with one bungalow and some detached properties. There is a broad mixture of house styles and finishes within the road.

No. 1 Kingsley Avenue is a two-storey semi-detached house finished with red bricks to just above the ground floor windows with a pebble dashed finish above reaching to the soffit and fascia boards. The front elevation has bay windows to the ground and first floor and the roof is hipped and finished with grey slate with a gable feature above the first floor bay window. Windows are wood framed, painted white and there is a small canopy over the front door. The front amenity area is enclosed with a low red brick wall with wrought iron detail, between brick posts. There is a garage to the southwest side of the main dwelling with dropped kerb access onto the road and this has a very shallow area to the front. On street parking is also available.

To the rear of the main dwelling there is a small amenity area enclosed with 1.8 metre high fence panels forming the boundary with the northeast neighbour at no.3 Kingsley Avenue. The rear boundary is formed from the brick built outbuildings and the boundary along the southwest side is comprised of a brick wall approximately 1.8 metres high which runs down to meet with an area to the rear of the garage. This area of land is elevated by approximately 1 metre above the side and rear amenity space to the main house. The boundary treatment along the southwest part of this area is formed of trellis panels with an open lattice pattern, separating this part of the application site from the rear gardens of the properties along Rockingham Road.

Proposed Development

The application seeks consent for a porch set to the side of the property at its frontage, two storey side and rear extensions, with a Juliet balcony to the rear and 3 new windows to the west side elevation.

In the originally submitted scheme the porch was positioned to the front, the side extension was single storey and a hip to gable roof enlargement to the southwest side with rear dormer and chimney alterations were proposed to facilitate a loft conversion. Concerns were raised in regard to the impact upon the character and appearance of the area and street scene and an objection form the occupants of no. 3 regarding the overbearing nature of the two storey rear extension and loss of privacy. Negotiations were entered into and it was agreed to move the porch so it was set back to the side, remove the hip to gable roof alteration, rear dormer and intended loft conversion from the scheme and step back the two storey rear extension away from the adjoining neighbour. The side extension was also increased to two storeys. The amended scheme was consulted on for 14 days.

Any Constraints Affecting the Site

Within the Nene Valley Nature Improvement Area (NIA) Boundary

4.0 Consultation and Customer Impact

Neighbours

Initial consultation - 2 representations have been made by neighbouring properties:

- No.3 Objection: concerns with respect to loss of light, intrusiveness and privacy from the two storey extension and Juliette balcony to the rear
- No.10 Objection: it is understood that the outbuildings shown within the application site are associated with No.188 Rockingham Road (giving a false impression of the plot size; existing windows are not UPVC, the proposed porch and hip-to-gable extension would be out of context and overdevelopment; a 4-bedroom property could lead to additional strain upon on-street car parking

A 14 day re-consultation upon revised plans is due to expire on 5th April 2018 – no comments received at the point in time of the publication of this report. Any responses received shall be reported by way of an Update to Committee.

5.0 Planning Policy

National Planning Policy Framework

Policy 6. Delivering a wide choice of high quality homes

Policy 7. Requiring good design

Development Plan Policies

North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy

Policy 8. North Northamptonshire Place Shaping Principles

Policy 11. The Network of Urban and Rural Areas

6.0 Financial/Resource Implications

None

7.0 Planning Considerations

The key issues for consideration in this application are:-

1. Principle of Development
2. Character and Design
3. Residential Amenity
4. Highways & Parking
5. Nene Valley Nature Improvement Area

1. Principle of Development

The application seeks the erection of a single storey side and rear extension.

The site is located within the designated town boundary; the scheme would therefore strengthen the network of settlements within the borough in compliance with Policy 11 of the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy.

Policy 8 of the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy is supportive of extensions to residential properties provided there is no adverse impact on character, appearance and residential amenity.

Subject to detailed consideration being given to the impact of the extension having an acceptable impact on the character and appearance of the area and residential amenity, and ensuring it complies with national and local policies detailed above, the principle of development is considered acceptable.

2. Character and Design

Policy 8(d)(i) of the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy requires new development to respond to the site's immediate and wider context and local character.

In this instance the proposals have been amended during the planning process in the interests of ensuring that the character of the application site and wider area is duly respected. Most notably, an originally proposed hip-to-gable extension and loft conversion has now been omitted from the scheme. The proposed extensions are now therefore focussed upon two-storey side and rear extensions with hipped roof designs to match existing, in addition to a single-storey porch feature to be located to the side of the property at its frontage (adjacent to Kingsley Avenue).

The proposed side and rear extensions are notable in scale, particularly being two stories in height. It is not however considered that they would have an unduly visually prominent impact; this is due to their proposed discreet location to the rear and setback from the streetscene. Indeed, the side extension would only protrude approximately 1.4m beyond the existing western side elevation of the property and would be setback some 10m from Kingsley Avenue. The side / rear extensions would not be widely visible from the public realm; particularly given the presence of a detached garage unit located to the western side of the site, which shields views from the southwest.

The application site would continue to be afforded a rear garden area of approximately 8-10m in depth following construction. It is not considered that the proposals represent an overdevelopment of the site therefore.

The amended design of the newly proposed porch sets it back in line with the existing front elevation of the property. It in fact would be positioned behind the front building line of the property's existing front-facing bay windows and would measure approximately 2.5m in width. It is considered, due to the discreet position and small scale of the porch and its design that assimilates with the design and roof pitch of the main dwelling, that it would acceptably respect the local character of the area and would be acceptable in visual terms. It would not unduly unbalance the appearance of a pair of semi-detached properties due to its scale and siting.

A planning condition would need to be attached to any permission to ensure that the external facing materials to be used match the appearance of the existing dwelling. It is proposed by the applicant that white UPVC windows be installed. This approach is considered to be acceptable. It has been noted via the consultation process that the front of the dwelling is afforded timber openings (although it should be noted that there are UPVC windows in existence already to the side and rear). The only new openings that would immediately address Kingsley Avenue would be contained within the ground floor level porch. There are already numerous examples of white UPVC windows facing Kingsley Avenue in the vicinity.

The scheme complies with Policy 8 (d) (i) of the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy.

3. Residential Amenity

In addition to seeking development to respect the character of an area, Policy 8(e) (i) of the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy seeks to ensure that development prevents harm to the residential amenities of neighbouring properties and of future occupiers, such as by reason of overbearing, loss of light or overlooking.

The proposals have undergone revision during the planning process so as to ensure that neighbouring amenity would be safeguarded. I.e. part of the two-storey rear extension has been stepped in from the eastern boundary of the site to the rear in the interests of relaxing the relationship with No. 3 Kingsley Avenue (No.3). Adjacent to the boundary, the two-storey extension is now proposed to extend approximately 2.1m to the rear (i.e. northwards). A further approximate 0.8m extension northwards is proposed to be set approximately 3m from the eastern boundary. Given the orientation of the site, the extension would only hold the potential to block light during late afternoon and evening hours. However, in light of the proposed stepped design and given that an existing single storey outrigger of similar depth serves No. 3 and is positioned on the boundary; it is not considered that the rear extension would have an unduly overbearing or overshadowing affect.

The newly proposed Juliette balcony within the rear extension would not link to any external standing area and would therefore not raise undue amenity concerns. It would directly overlook the rear amenity area of the application property, would be located approximately 4m away (to the side) from the boundary line with No. 3 and would not provide direct close-proximity sensitive views accordingly.

When considering amenity impacts to the west of the application site, it is noted that the proposed extensions would be set away from neighbouring built form (i.e. properties fronting Rockingham Road). Separation distances of at least 17-20m are achieved. The extensions would not therefore be overbearing or overshadowing in this context. 3no. new western side-facing window openings are proposed as part of the development. One of these would be sited at first floor level and would serve a bedroom area. It is not considered that that this raises undue amenity concerns given the separation distance to neighbouring property and that some degree of mutual overlooking already exists in this locality. It would however be prudent, in the interests of ensuring appropriate levels of privacy, to withdraw permitted development rights with respect to any further openings within the western flank wall and roof plane of the property – to be secured via condition.

In terms of future occupiers, it is considered that their amenities would also be appropriately safeguarded. Whilst the newly proposed porch to the side would effectively infill an external pathway that provides direct access to the rear of the property, it should be noted that the porch contains door openings to its front and rear (i.e. to ensure that occupants would continue to be able to use the rear amenity for bin storage via the porch).

The scheme complies with Policy 8 (e) (i) of the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy.

4. Highways & Parking

No alterations are proposed to existing access and parking arrangements at the property. It has been questioned by a neighbour whether the garage block in the southwest corner of the application site is associated with No.1 Kingsley Avenue (or potentially No.188 Rockingham Road to the west). The garage is within the same ownership as No.1 Kingsley Avenue and is within the curtilage of this property, as confirmed by the applicant's agent, and it would be retained as part of the proposals. It is not considered necessary to affirm any further details in this regard for the purposes of determining this planning application, which is purely for extensions to the existing single residential dwelling. The potential additional demand for car parking would be negligible given that the proposals would add a moderate extent of additional living space (including the addition of 1no. bedroom). The proposals would not prejudice highway safety in accordance with Policy 8 (b) (i) of the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy.

5. Nene Valley Nature Improvement Area

The application site is within the NIA boundary, however, the application site is in an established residential area and the proposed scheme is small and on an already developed site. It is considered the small scale of the development proposed will have no any adverse impact on existing wildlife or the improvement of the Nene Valley.

Conclusion

It is considered that the proposals comply with the requirements of the Development Plan; visual and residential amenity would be appropriately safeguarded and the scheme is recommended for approval accordingly.

Background Papers

Title of Document:

Date:

Contact Officer:

Previous Reports/Minutes

Ref:

Date:

Ruth James, Assistant Development Officer on 01536 534316