

BOROUGH OF KETTERING

Committee	Full Planning Committee - 11/10/2011	Item No: 5.2
Report Originator	Peter Chaplin Development Manager	Application No: KET/2011/0344
Wards Affected	Barton	
Location	11 Westminster Drive, Barton Seagrave	
Proposal	Full Application: Single storey rear extension	
Applicant	Mr & Mrs Garrod	

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 external walls shall be constructed in natural stone and shall not be laid, coursed or pointed other than in accordance with a sample panel which shall have been constructed on site and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the commencement of construction of any such external walls. As approved, the sample panel shall be retained on site and kept available for re-inspection throughout the construction period.

REASON: In the interests of the heritage asset and policies of PPS 5, and in accordance with policies 13 of the North Northamptonshire Core Spatial Strategy and policy 27 of the East Midlands Regional Plan

3. The roofing material shall be natural slate in accordance with a sample that shall have been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority prior to development commencing. The development shall not be carried out other than in accordance with the approved details.

REASON: In the interests of the visual amenities of the area in accordance with policy 13 of the North Northamptonshire Core Spatial Strategy, and Policy 27 of East Midlands Regional Plan. Also in recognition of the policies of PPS5

4. The roof lights shall be conservation type in accordance with a sample first shown to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. They shall be fitted and retained as flush with the plane of the roof slates.

REASON: In accordance with the policy 13 of the North Northamptonshire Core Spatial Strategy, and Policy 27 of the East Midland Regional Plan, and in accordance with the policies of PPS 5

5. The windows and doors shall be of timber and in accordance with the revised plan ref 2011-04(5) dated 30/08/11.

REASON: In accordance with the policy 13 of the North Northamptonshire Core Spatial Strategy, and Policy 27 of the East Midland Regional Plan, and in accordance with the policies of PPS 5

Notes (if any) :-

Justification for Granting Planning Permission

The proposal is in accordance with national and local policies as set out in Planning Policy Statements 1 and 5 and Policy 27 of The East Midlands Regional Plan, Policy 13 of the North Northamptonshire Core Spatial Strategy. The proposal is also in accordance with adopted Supplementary Planning Document Sustainable Design. There are no material considerations that indicate against the proposal.

Officers Report

3.0 Information

Planning and Building Control History at Hall Farm, Barton Seagrave

KET/95/0374: outline for residential development, conversion of existing buildings, open space, demolition of existing buildings; Approved 13/03/98.

KE/95/0375/CA: Conservation Area Consent application: proposed demolition relating to the outline for residential development, conversion of existing buildings, open space, Land at Hall Farm, Barton Seagrave.

This showed a proposed scheme which included the property now No. 11 Westminster Drive which was part of a complex of then existing farm buildings. The file includes photographs of the then extant buildings. This application was withdrawn on 13 September 1995, pending further investigation of proposals.

KE/1999/0657: Planning permission for residential barn conversion (of what would have been Plot 8 on the Plan under the 2000 applications.) Approved 20/06/2000. However, LBC was required too under separate decision. This permission did not relate to the alterations for the property now known as 11 Westminster Drive

KE/2000/0368: Conversion of existing buildings to residential and construction of one new house and part demolition of existing structures: This was approved on 01 August 2000. Permitted development rights were removed in regard to 1995 GPDO Schedule 2 Parts 1 and 2. However, these approved plans do not relate to the alterations that took place at what is 11 Westminster Drive.

KE/2000/0374/LB: This is the Listed Building Consent that related to similar plans showing the same proposals as for KET/2000/0368. Granted 03/08/2000. For the same reason as stated above, the development to form 11 Westminster Drive would not relate back to this consent.

KE 2001/0274: "Conversion and erection of a dwelling, Plot 1, conversion of barn into 2 No. dwellings including partial demolition and rebuilding of east facing gable, Plots 5 and 6; Demolition and rebuild of barn into 2 dwellings- Plots No. 3 and 4" This is the approval that relates to what is extant at Plot 4 or what is now 11 Westminster Drive. Future proposals under Schedule 2 Part 1 and Part 2 developments as defined by the 1995 GPDO were excluded unless a separate approval was given, Condition 7 of KE 2001 0274 applies).

A letter (dated 21 May 2001) and copies of photos on file from the applicant's engineer indicated that there was widespread cracking with several openings in the building and a proposal to demolish upto a "appropriate point close to the single storey" The report also acknowledges that these ranges are curtilage listed.

KET/2001/0331: This is the Listed building consent that related to the works that led to the creation of the dwelling known as 11 Westminster Drive. The Officer's report noted that "with the demolition of the metal (agricultural)

building (attached to the range) and following “commencement of works on site it (became) apparent that part of the range of barns is not capable of conversion without rebuilding”. It was noted in the report that “the extent of the rebuilding (was) much greater than originally perceived”. The demolition of that part of the former range was explicit therefore in the consideration of the 2001 application.

Building Regulation approval: Ref BR/01/0015/FPs identified the alteration to the former barns. This and other records also confirms that there is evidence that parts of the original buildings were retained, ie relating to No. 3; No.5; No.7 and No.9 Westminster Drive. The property at No. 11 Westminster Drive is physically joined to buildings which in part retain what appears original fabric.

Site Description

Officer's site inspection was carried out on 08 April 2011 at pre application stage and subsequent visits made after the current applications had been received.

The property is part of a range of former traditional farm buildings some of which have varying degrees of rebuild, some retaining older fabric. They have been converted to residential use. In consideration of case law and from examining the evidence, this are technically curtilage

The property at 11 Westminster Drive is accessed via a private driveway adjacent to the adjoining 13 Westminster Drive,

No 11 Westminster Drive is a part of a rectangular two storey building, with the longest sides orientated north-south. The main building is faced in stone with a slate roof. The window and door openings have timber frames, albeit that they show signs of the need for continuing maintenance. The east facing elevation looks towards a 1.8m high rear fence enclosing a private garden space.

In front of the west elevation of the main part of the property are a garden and car standing areas, with a separate brick garage. Approx 1.8m high close boarded fences separate the gardens between the adjoining dwelling units that are part of the “barn conversion” Shrubs are also planted and these are close to the edge of the garden.

Proposed Development

As amended the applications seek respectively planning permission and Listed Building consent for a single storey (2.5m to eaves) lean to extension onto the east facing elevation. The extension would be placed in front of a current large opening on the elevation. The side elevation of the proposed extension shows “rebated agricultural style windows” ie simple casements, as well as full height glazed doors.

Two small roof lights are be flush mounted to follow the plane or line of the slates on the roof.

(NB Initially, the proposals also included replacement of the timber doors with

upvc material, a proposed fence or wall at the western side at the boundary with the shared drive. However, taking account of advice given at both pre and application stages, these relevant parts have been withdrawn from the current applications, pending further consideration by the applicants.)

Any Constraints Affecting the Site

The site lies within Barton Sergrave Conservation Area, and is part of the curtilage to the listed building known as Hall Farm house.

4.0 Consultation and Customer Impact

Highway Authority (HA): At pre application stage when there was a proposal to erect a wall alongside the shared drive, the HA commented that Westminster Drive is not an adopted highway and there is no S38 agreement in place. They pointed out that were it to be put forward for adoption the proposed wall would be too close to what would be highway boundary and the wall in that instance could be deemed as an obstruction to pedestrian visibility and make it difficult to open a door of a vehicle parked nearby.

Other Local Authorities/NCC No comments

Environment Agency No comments

Neighbours: One letter of objection received: "The long barns are curtilage listed and are part of the heritage structures auxiliary to Hall Farm House, (grade 2 listed) The shape of the Long Barn is integral to the heritage structure and it is intrinsic to the importance of this integrity that its shape should be maintained in its original form. If chunks are added on here and there will be no historic importance or link to the nature of the structure. Any changes to the historic asset should make a positive contribution to that asset and not detract from it. Any changes should benefit the distinctiveness of the historic environment in a positive way, this application does not fulfil that criteria"

5.0 Planning Policy

National Policies

PPS 1: Sustainable Development

PPS5:

Policy HE 6.1: Applicant to provide a description of the heritage assets affected and the contribution of their setting to that significance. Consult the relevant historic environment record

Policy HE9.1:

Presumption in favour of the conservation of designated heritage assets. The more significant the designated heritage asset, the greater the presumption in favour of its conservation should be;. Loss affecting any designated heritage

asset should require clear and convincing justification

Policy HE9.2: Where the application will lead to substantial harm to or total loss of significance LPA should refuse consent unless it can be demonstrated, this is necessary in order to deliver substantial public benefits that outweigh that harm or loss or the nature of the heritage asset prevents all reasonable uses of the site and no viable use of the heritage asset itself can be found in the medium term; and no grant funding available; harm or loss is outweighed by benefits of bringing the site back into use

Policy HE9.4: Where a proposal has a harmful impact on the significance of a designated heritage asset which is less than substantial harm, the LPA should weigh the public benefit of the proposal against the harm, recognise that the greater the harm to the significance of the heritage asset the greater the justification will be needed for any loss

Development Plan Policies

East Midlands Regional Plan: Policy 27 Regional priorities for the historic environment

North Northamptonshire Core Spatial Strategy: Policy 13: Development not to result in unacceptable impact on the amenities of neighbouring properties;

Sustainable Design SPD

6.0 Financial/Resource Implications

None

7.0 Planning Considerations

The following are considerations pertinent to the respective applications:-

S 38 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 planning applications must be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise

S16(2) of Listed Buildings Conservation Areas Act 1990: Special regard to preserve architectural historic interest;

S72 Listed Buildings Conservation Areas Act 1990 Character and appearance of the conservation area

The issues arising are:

- The principle of extension to a building used as a dwelling;
- The impact on the complex of former farm buildings and account of its significance ;
- The impact on the character and appearance of the conservation area;
- The affect on residential amenity

In principle, the scope of buildings in residential use to be suitably extended is accepted as a sustainable way of allowing for buildings to adapt to the changing needs of occupiers. In this case the proposed extension is modest and intended in a part of the property that is not dominant within the public realm, nor likely to cause a loss of amenity to other residents. Furthermore, the proposal for a lean- to extension follows the development grain of the main building and would be clearly subordinate. Stone and slate are suitable materials.

Therefore, I conclude that the approach satisfies the definition of sustainable development. Indeed, in many cases small extensions of this sort are permitted development. In this case however, both planning permission and listed building consent are required

I turn now to the issue of the impact on the significance of the buildings as part of the former building range, as curtilage to the listed Hall Farm House.

In allowing conversion/ part rebuild of the former farm buildings a degree of alteration already has already occurred eg insertion of dormers, has changed the previous barn like characteristics of the range. Nevertheless, the relatively simple linear form remains. Whilst simplicity does reflect the essence of the development as it exists, the proposed extension as subordinate to the main building and flowing with the grain of development does not alter the overall balance. Indeed there is some indication from the planning history that a small extension to the former barns has been attached to part of the range.

The degree of alteration and rebuild to the former farm buildings has taken place to facilitate the residential use. In terms of PPS 5, for the reasons stated above, I conclude that the current proposals do not adversely affect the significance of the building range to which it would be attached. Furthermore, if the alteration were considered to be harm, it would be minor.

Character and appearance of the Conservation Area

The form of the existing buildings and their materials is seen within the context as part of the Barton Seagrave Conservation. It would not easily be read from the public realm, as it is largely behind a domestic garden fence. The proposed slate roof and stone elevation materials would be in keeping with what already exists. Conservation roof lights should be constructed flush with the plane of the roof slates.

Subject to conditioning of materials for the wall and roof of the proposed extension, and suitable window/door details, I conclude that the proposal is acceptable in terms of its impact on the character and appearance of the conservation area.

Residential amenity:

Policy 13 of the CSS refers to amenity considerations. The main residential

impact is on the property itself. Due to scale of the proposal and boundary screening there will be overlooking or overbearing on it will not neighbours adjacent or to the rear. No adjoining neighbours have objected.

Comments on other points raised by proposal:

I note a recent application (KET 2010/ 0772) for a proposed extension to another nearby property (5 Westminster Drive). Here the impact was quite different and design was a key reason for refusal relative to the historical and architectural interest of the listed building and its context. The current proposal is quite different and does not raise similar concerns.

Conclusion

That respectively, planning permission and LBC be granted

Background Papers

Title of Document:

Date:

Contact Officer:

Previous Reports/Minutes

Ref:

Date:

Peter Chaplin, Development Manager on 01536 534316

SITE LOCATION PLAN

11 Westminster Drive, Barton Seagrave
Application No.: KET/2011/0354



Reproduced from the Ordnance Survey mapping with the permission of the Controller of Her Majesty's Stationery Office © Crown copyright. Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown copyright and may lead to prosecution or civil proceedings.

LA078344

Date: 13/06/2011 Do not scale from this map. For illustrative purposes only.

