

BOROUGH OF KETTERING

Committee	Full Planning Committee - 08/05/2018	Item No: 5.8
Report Originator	Sean Bennett Senior Development Officer	Application No: KET/2018/0209
Wards Affected	Burton Latimer	
Location	5 Rye Close, Burton Latimer	
Proposal	Full Application: Replace garage to include habitable accommodation with storage above and single storey extension to link	
Applicant	Mrs K Jones	

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. No development shall take place on site (including demolition) until a scheme for boundary treatment (including the provision of a gated access to the created alleyway) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall not be occupied until the approved scheme has been fully implemented in accordance with the approved details.

REASON: In the interests of the amenity and protecting the privacy of the neighbouring property in accordance with Policy 8 of the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy.

4. The walls and roof of the proposal, hereby permitted, shall match, in type, colour and texture, those on the existing dwelling unless otherwise agreed in a

discharge of conditions application, in which case the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

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

5. The extension permitted shall not be occupied other than as part of the single residential use of the dwelling known as 5 Rye Close.

REASON: The unit of accommodation is not of a satisfactory standard to be occupied separately from the main dwelling in the interests of amenity in accordance with Policy 8 of the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy.

6. The garage shown on the approved drawings shall remain available for the parking of vehicles.

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

7. 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 south/ rear facing 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/2018/0209

3.0 Information

Relevant Planning History

KET/2005/0876 - Erection of conservatory to rear of property – APPROVED – 07/11/2005

Site Visit

Officer's site inspection was carried out on 26/03/2018 and 25/04/2018

Site Description

The site consists of a detached red-brick property with dormers in the roof space and forms part of a wider development of similar dwellings constructed in the early 2000's. Access is off a cul-de-sac and shares a drive with a neighbouring property. The dwelling has a detached double garage forward of the dwelling which faces the access.

Pre-application

Pre-application advice was given under reference PRE/2017/0125 where the Officer advised that the proposal was likely to be considered acceptable providing that it was ancillary to the dwelling, was not significantly higher than the existing garage and that the flat-roof dormer was not overly large.

The proposal has been submitted broadly in accordance with this advice.

Proposed Development

The application seeks full planning permission for replacement of the existing double garage with an extension consisting of a single garage and ancillary domestic accommodation to the ground floor and within the roof space which includes a front facing flat-roof dormer and the provision of a linking element to the front of the existing dwelling which has a front dual roof pitch and a flat-roof to the rear.

It is understood that the additional accommodation is proposed for the use of elderly relatives.

Any Constraints Affecting the Site

None

4.0 Consultation and Customer Impact

Burton Latimer Town Council: No comments received at the time of writing this report

Neighbours: Two third party objections received from adjacent residents at 15 Wheatfield Drive to the south and 6 Rye Close to the north. The grounds for objection are summarised below:

- Loss of light having an adverse impact on quality of life

- Design not in-keeping with surrounding properties with no surrounding precedent – particular with regard the flat-roof dormer – harmful to the areas character and appearance
- Question whether demolition of the existing garage is necessary – alternative options should be explored
- Inconvenience caused as a result of the re-positioning of the garage and to safety within the shared access area as a result of a change to manoeuvring arrangements
- Potential future subsidence issues due to proximity to a watercourse
- Crime concerns as a result of a passageway being created to the side and rear of the proposal
- Loss of privacy due to the change in orientation of the front door
- Property devaluation

5.0 Planning Policy

National Planning Policy Framework

Core principles and Chapter 7 (Requiring good design)

Development Plan Policies

North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy (JCS):

Policy 8: Place shaping

Local Plan (LP):

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. Principle of development
2. Impact on the character and appearance of the area
3. Impact on residential amenity
4. Impact on highway safety and convenience
5. Response to objectors

1. Principle of development

The site is located within the Town's designated boundaries, associated with the dwellings domestic use and thereby complies with Policy 35 of the LP and therefore is acceptable in principle.

In terms of whether the proposal is incidental to the existing dwelling; the proposal provides internal links to the existing dwelling and notably would share a front door, kitchen and living space. As such whilst the proposal would provide some habitable accommodation associated with independent living

(bedroom and shower-room) occupiers of the proposal would be dependent on the existing dwelling for day-to-day needs and access and thereby is ancillary. A safeguarding condition shall be attached to ensure that the proposal remains ancillary.

2. Impact on the character and appearance of the area

Policy 8 (d) of the JCS seeks development to respond to local character consistent with Chapter 7 of the NPPF.

The area has a suburban spacious quality generally with open frontages, spacing's between dwellings and open land to the east although there are certain areas that have a rather cramped built form and close relationship particularly at junctions and at the turning heads.

The proposal would involve substantially demolishing the existing garage forward of the main house with a portion of its rear and side wall retained as boundary. The replacement building would have much the same footprint as the garage with an eaves and overall height approximately 500mm higher. The floor level however would be dropped 300mm below the existing. A link is also proposed between the building and the house and a flat-roof dormer to the front roof plane of the main part of the development facing the access.

In terms of scale; the proposal is not significantly greater than the existing garage and the link is not especially prominent and as such its bulk is not considered to be excessive or otherwise considered to be out of place in a residential area. Flat-roof dormers generally are not considered to be the best design approach given their top-heavy emphasis although they are not altogether an alien prospect in such areas. There are no examples in the locality, however of such dormers and therefore the proposal is not strictly consistent with its surroundings in this regard. For the dormer element to be unacceptable however demonstrable harm to the areas character and appearance should be evident.

Due to the location of the proposal; set back from the turning head of a cul-de-sac and at the end of a shared access the development would not be conspicuous from the public realm. This thereby significantly limits its visual impact on the streetscape and from where it can be experienced from public areas to such a degree that the prospect of the dormer is not considered to be harmful to the areas character and appearance. Rooms above garages are also not an alien prospect in the area and can be seen elsewhere in the cul-de-sac.

As such the proposal is considered to respect the character and appearance of the area and therefore the proposal is acceptable in this regard.

3. Impact on residential amenity

Policy 8 (e) of the JCS seeks to secure a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings.

The existing garage which partially forms the shared boundary with 15

Wheatfield Drive to the south-east is currently 10m from the closest facing (kitchen) window of that property. The proximity of the garage, together with its higher (0.3m) ground level and also their garage along a side boundary rather encloses the rear garden to 15 Wheatfield Drive.

The proposal would remove the garage although its rear wall would remain as a boundary. This wall could reasonably be reduced in height with details of its retained height to be provided by condition. The proposal would be set 0.9m off the shared boundary, which with the lower floor levels would be only 200mm higher to eaves and ridge when compared with the existing garage. With the reduced height of the boundary treatment and its set-back the main element of the proposal is not considered to result in a significant change from the sense of enclosure currently experienced at 15 Wheatfield Drive. The prospect of any openings being created in the rear of the garage (including its roof) shall be prevented by condition. The linking element of the proposal would partially enclose a longer view between the existing garage and the host dwelling currently seen from the rear windows and garden of 15 Wheatfield Drive. This view however is against a backdrop of built form. In addition the linked element is set-back 2.5m from the boundary, lower than the main part of the proposal, which would replace the existing garage, and the rear part (closest to 15 Wheatfield Drive) would have a flat-roof. As such whilst there would be a change to the outlook experienced within the rear area of 15 Wheatfield Close the proposal is not considered to significantly worsen the existing outlook and therefore is not considered to be detrimental to the quality of life of this neighbour.

Turning to the impact of the proposal to 6 Rye Close to the north. Given the obliqueness of the windows and the door toward the front elevation of 6 Rye Close, which will directly face the access drive the proposal would not result in any notable overlooking issues toward the 6 Rye Close. In addition as that the proposal is set 0.9m further forward than the existing comparatively sized garage with at least 7m obliquely angled distance from the closest front window of 6 Rye Close the proposal would not cause any overbearing or overshadowing issues to that neighbour. Whilst the dormer has been acknowledged as a feature not strictly consistent with the area, it has been accepted in this regard (discussed above), views of the dormer experienced from the front windows of 6 Rye Close, in its front area or approach are not considered to be so offensive or prominent so as to harm residential amenity.

The proposal would mean that access to the rear area is possible to the side of the development. This is currently possible with the existing arrangement between the garage and the dwelling. The entrance to the passageway however is more visible on the approach and therefore from a planning out crime perspective it would be advisable if this entrance was gated. This will be conditioned.

Thereby the proposal would not have an adverse impact to the residential amenities of surrounding dwellings and therefore is considered to be acceptable in this respect.

4. 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 property currently has comfortable space for the parking of four vehicles (including the garage). As a result of the proposal three spaces would be retained (including 1 garage space). This amount of provision is considered to be sufficient.

The access and turning space is shared with 5 Rye Close. Whilst the building would mean that 1m length of this parking area is lost at least 6m length would be available for parking with sufficient area in front of this area to enable vehicles using the parking area associated with 6 Rye Close to enter and leave the site in a forward gear. The proposed garage shall be reserved to be available for car parking by condition. As such and as there are no changes proposed to the existing access arrangements the proposal would not result in an increased highway safety risk.

5. Response to objectors

The matters raised by the third party objectors with respect to harm to residential amenity, character and appearance of the area, crime and parking arrangements are considered above and are not found to have adverse impact subject to conditions.

The issues with regard devaluation of property is not considered to be a material planning consideration and matters arising from possible subsidence would be dealt with by building regulations at the time of construction. The remaining point opining that there may be better options available are not for consideration here with the application being considered as submitted on its merits.

Conclusion

In light of the above and with no other material considerations 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 subject to the imposition of the conditions laid out.

Background Papers

Title of Document:

Date:

Contact Officer:

Sean Bennett, Senior Development Officer on 01536 534316

Previous Reports/Minutes

Ref:

Date: