

---

**Application for Planning Permission**


---

**18/00668/DPA****Two storey side extension, part two storey rear extension and part single storey rear extension AT 6 Studfall Avenue, Corby****1.0 Site and Surroundings:**

- 1.1 The site is located within the Lloyds Conservation Area at the north east end of Studfall Avenue. The property is an end terrace bookend of a block of three. The block is an example of a group D building as set out in the Lloyds Conservation Area Appraisal – a 3 house block with central projecting gabled wing that forms a separate house. As with many buildings in the conservation area, the building has been constructed from red brick. All windows on the terrace block have been replaced with white UPVC.
- 1.2 The subject property has a modest front garden, demarcated by a red brick wall. A large tandem driveway extends alongside the south western elevation. The property's rear garden borders an open public green space.

**2.0 The Proposal:**

- 2.1 The application seeks consent for a part two storey and part single storey rear extension and for a two storey side extension.
- 2.2 The two storey side extension projects approximately 1.7m from the side elevation set back approximately 5.9m from the front elevation. The proposed eave height is approximately 5.8m, the same as the main dwellinghouse. The proposed ridge height is approximately 6.4m, stepped down considerably from the 7.5m ridge height of the existing dwellinghouse. The roof is hipped and extends into the existing roof. The extension projects approximately 3m into the rear garden, wrapping around the main dwellinghouse to form the 2 storey element of the rear extension. Two small windows have been proposed for the front elevation, one on each floor in line with one another.
- 2.3 The two storey rear extension extends for approximately 5.3m along the rear elevation. The ridge and eave height is the same as the side extension.
- 2.4 As the rear extension gets nearer to the boundary of the attached 4 Studfall Avenue the proposal drops to a single storey for approximately 2.5m, stopping approximately 0.3m from the boundary. Here the ridge height is approximately 3.5m and eave height approximately 2.3m.
- 2.5 Two windows have been proposed from the rear elevation, both of different sizes on both floors of the property. A large bi-fold door is proposed to run across the width of the single storey rear extension and part of the two storey rear extension.
- 2.6 The ground floor extension will extend the existing kitchen to the side and rear, with the single storey element of the extension housing a new dining area. A wall will be opened up between the existing lounge and proposed dining room to create an open plan living space.
- 2.7 On the first floor, a small back bedroom will be extended to form a larger master bedroom, with an en-suit housed in the side extension.
- 2.8 A red facing brick and red tile roof have been proposed, with samples submitted to the Local Planning Authority. The proposed windows are UPVC. All materials will match the existing facing materials.

### **3.0 Planning History:**

- 3.1 18/00436/DPA – Two storey side and single storey rear extension. Application refused on 17th August 2018 for the impact upon the street scene with a conservation area, negative impacts on neighbouring amenity and a reduction in parking provision.

### **4.0 Policies:**

- 4.1 Policy 2 and 8 of the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy (NNJCS) (2016)  
4.2 “Saved” Policy P10(R) of the Corby Borough Local Plan (1997)  
4.3 National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2018)  
4.4 Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended)

### **5.0 Internal Consultations:**

- 5.1 Environmental Protection Officer – No comments or objections raised.
- 5.2 Conservation Officer – Supports application. In summary states the following:
- 5.2.1 The rear and side extension has been set across the rear of the house, visible to the left hand side, which with the matching pair of semi detached houses, has reduced the impact of the extension from the street scene, as a result the sensitive location helps to ensure that the proposed extension appears smaller from within the Conservation area, than in reality and as a result does not dominate the street or the house itself.
- 5.2.2 The hipped end design and matching materials, added to by the fact the extension is set towards the back of the house, results in an appropriate extension within the conservation area.
- 5.2.3 The proposed windows match the existing in style, complete with top hung vent lights, which reflect the historic character of the original thin framed metal windows. The use of UPVC windows within the conservation area is to be avoided where possible, maintaining the traditional materials of the area, which in this case is timber sub frame and metal casement windows, however it is recognised that the character of the windows are thin framed, equal panes, a mix of side and top hung, is in this case of greater importance.
- 5.2.4 This proposed extension largely to the rear of a pair of semi detached house within the Lloyds Conservation Area helps maintain the symmetry of the design of the original and the character of the area.
- 5.2.5 I am in support of the rear and side extension, with the following conditions:-
- 5.2.6 Provision of external materials, roof tiles, hip tiles and facing brickwork to be made available on site prior to commencement, to be agreed in writing.
- 5.2.7 Full details, including drawings of the doors and windows, at an appropriate scale of, 1:10 and 1:20, sections and elevations, to support the limited details provided within the application elevational drawings.
- 5.3 Conservation Officer – Materials discharged, further information required on the doors and windows.
- 5.4 Conservation Officer – Windows and door design discharged. No conditions needed.
- 5.5 Highways Officer – Below the consultation threshold. No comments.
- 5.6 Tree Officer – Supports application. Summary of comments as follows:
- 5.6.1 There is a large tree rear of the boundary. Too far to be affected. No conditions needed.
- ### **6.0 Advertisement**
- 6.1 Site Notice – Originally posted 19/10/2018 on adjacent lamppost on Studfall Avenue. Re-advertised 04/12/2018 to correct a syntax error within the description.

- 6.2 Newspaper Advertisement (Evening Telegraph) – Originally published 16/10/2018. Re-published 06/12/2018 to correct a syntax error within the description.
- 6.3 Neighbour notifications were sent to the following addresses on 15/10/2018: 4, 5, 7 and 8 Studfall Avenue. Neighbours were re-notified on 03/12/2018 to correct a syntax error within the description. Additionally 2 and 2B Studfall were sent this new notification as they had objected within the first consultation period. An additional letter was sent to 4 Studfall Avenue 19/12/2018 as the software had failed to generate the original re-notification believed to have been sent 03/12/2018.

## **7.0 Representation**

- 7.1 Multiple objections were received many of these were not material planning considerations. A breakdown of the materials planning objections is set out as follows:
  - 7.1.1 The existing dwellinghouse is of an adequate size for the applicants (not a material planning consideration).
  - 7.1.2 Construction noise, smell, dust and general disturbance during development (not a material planning consideration – covered by environmental legislation restricting noise levels at certain times of day, controlling pollution, etc.).
  - 7.1.3 Oversubscribed local parking provisions – highways safety (addressed in ‘highways safety’).
  - 7.1.4 Overshadowing and loss of light within downstairs bathroom (addressed in ‘neighbouring amenity’).
  - 7.1.5 Right of way across number 6 Studfall Avenue’s rear garden and damage to a neighbouring garden if moved (not a material planning consideration. Civil matter to be resolved between residents).
  - 7.1.6 Look out of place and poor design (addressed in ‘Impact upon the Street Scene and Conservation Area’).
  - 7.1.7 Loss of water during construction (not a material planning consideration. Civil matter to be resolved between residents).
  - 7.1.8 Inconsistency with the bi-fold door design between the large site elevations, and the detailed door drawings. Addressed with amended drawing.
  - 7.1.9 Traffic problems during construction (below the threshold to be considered an issue. Addressed in ‘highways safety’).

## **8.0 Officer’s Assessment**

### **8.1 Key Determining Issues:**

Principal of Development  
Neighbouring Amenity  
Design and Impact upon the Street Scene and Conservation Area  
Highways Safety

### **8.2 Principal of Development**

- 8.2.1 The application seeks consent for a two storey side extension and part two storey and part single storey rear extension. The current application is a revision of a previously refused application reference number 18/00436/DPA, dated 17<sup>th</sup> August 2018.
- 8.2.2 The refused application (18/00436/DPA) was refused on the grounds that officers considered the scheme to be unacceptable due to the impact upon the street scene within a conservation area, loss of neighbouring amenity and highways safety issues.

- 8.2.3 The current scheme is a revised proposal that has taken account of the reasons for refusal and have amended the scheme.
- 8.2.4 The revised proposal in its amended form results in a scheme that results the nature of the Conservation Area and wider area. The rear extension's depth has been reduced by approximately 0.4m, protecting neighbouring amenity. Two off road parking spaces have been maintained in line with the Northamptonshire County Council Parking Standards Guidance (2016).
- 8.2.5 The principal of development is considered acceptable given that the site is within an established residential area, the proposal in terms of its design, scale and appearance respects the character and setting of the Conservation area and would not result in an adverse impact on residential amenity or parking availability.

### 8.3 Neighbouring Amenity

- 8.3.1 In regards to impact upon residential amenity and privacy, the neighbouring properties number 4 and 8 Studfall Avenue would not be adversely affected by the proposal due to the proposal not directly overlooking upon these neighbouring properties more than already exists. No windows or doors are proposed to the side elevations (north or south). Nonetheless, as an added safeguard a condition is recommended for no additional windows or openings to be created to the side (north) elevation as this would look directly into number 4's rear garden.
- 8.3.2 It is acknowledged that the proposal for the single storey rear elements will only just pass the 45 degree line test for the window of the attached neighbouring property number 4, who has raised this concern. However, this room is a bathroom and not considered a habitable room. Additionally, given that this element of the proposal is for a single storey structure not exceeding 3m in depth that could have been constructed under Permitted Development Rights (The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended)), it is not demonstrably harmful to the impact on residential amenities of number 4 Studfall Avenue so as to warrant the refusal of the application.
- 8.3.3 Number 8's side (north) elevation is located 4.5m from the proposal's southern side elevation, passing the 45 degree test with ease.
- 8.3.4 The proposal is not considered overbearing or overshadowing upon neighbours' amenity due to its scale, siting and separation distance. The proposal is not considered to cause loss of privacy nor will it significantly affect the level of light currently enjoyed by any of the neighbouring properties.
- 8.3.5 The proposal is therefore considered to be acceptable in terms of their impact upon the amenity of neighbouring properties and accords with Policy 8 of the Joint Core Strategy.

### 8.4 Design and Impact upon the Street Scene and Conservation Area

- 8.4.1 In line with Section 71(1) of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 and paragraph 196 of the NPPF (2018) special attention should be given to the preservation and enhancement of development within conservation areas. The proposed side extension will be visible from the road. However it considered acceptable in design and scale terms. It will appear subservient as it will be viewed against the backdrop of the original larger building and will have a lower ridge height than the host dwelling. Furthermore the two storey side extension is set back 5.9m from the front elevation. The original refused application was set 0.4m back from the front elevation and incorporated a ground floor car port type area out of keeping with the Conservation Area. The conservation officer supports the application.
- 8.4.2 Additionally, appeal reference number: APP/U2805/D/18/316992 53 Tanfields Grove was allowed 15th May 2018 for a larger two storey side extension also within the Llyod's Conservation Area. The Planning Inspector's stated that a number of dwellings similar to the appeal property have been extended to the side at two storeys and whilst some of these detract from the host property, others fit in well with the established street scene. Moreover, a prominent gable between

two similar wings would echo one of the other designs types seen on the estate and would not be incongruous in or unsympathetic to the conservation area.

- 8.4.3 The properties rear boundary is located 14m from the rear of the proposed elevation, overlooking public recreational ground, with a further 30m separating the rear boundary from public footpaths. As such, the rear elevation is considered to have minimal impact upon the Conservation Area.
- 8.4.4 The proposed materials and detailed drawing of the windows where approved be the conservation officer.
- 8.4.5 The revised proposal has resulted in preserving the character of the Conservation Area, with minimal harm to its overall character and appearance, complying with Policy 2 and 8 of the NNJCS (2016), the NPPF (2018), Saved Policy 10(R) of the Corby Local Plan (1997) and the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

## 8.5 Highways Safety

- 8.5.1 A concern raised in the original refusal and from neighbours focuses on the loss of off street parking which could result in excessive on street parking stress.
- 8.5.2 The site currently benefits from an existing vehicular access and an area of hardstanding which can accommodate 2 off-street parking spaces to the side of the property. There is a detached garage towards the rear of the property, but this does not conform to Northamptonshire Parking Standards and is too small to accommodate a modern vehicle.
- 8.5.3 Under the Northamptonshire Parking Standards, two spaces should be supplied for a dwelling of three bedrooms.
- 8.5.4 Two spaces will remain once the development is complete running in tandem along the side of the property. These will measure 12m in length, adhering to advice within the Northamptonshire Parking Standards (2016).
- 8.5.5 A neighbour raised a concern regarding increased traffic during construction. The Local Planning Authority can impose pre-commencement conditions that would require the applicant to produce construction management plans. This is usually reserved for large developments. Any condition attached to a planning application must be considered reasonable. Imposing this condition upon a small householder extension is considered unreasonable. The additional construction traffic will be minimal.
- 8.5.6 The proposal is therefore not considered to cause excessive parking stress and accords with Policy 8 of the Joint Core Strategy.

## 9.0 Conclusion

- 9.1 Overall the proposal results in an acceptable scheme in terms of its design and impact upon the Conservation Area, impacts upon the amenity of neighbours and parking stress. The proposal is therefore considered acceptable and compliant with the National Planning Policy Framework (2018), The North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy (2016).

**Recommendation: Approve subject to the following conditions:**

### 1. Full planning permission

The development hereby permitted shall begin before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

**Reason:** As required by Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

### 2. List of Approved Plans and Drawings

The development shall conform in all aspects with the plans and details shown in the application as listed below, unless variations are agreed by the Local Planning Authority in order to discharge other conditions attached to this decision:

Amended Plans

Drawing Number 18/9/1A received 02/11/2018

Location Plan

Received 01/10/2018

**Reason:** For the avoidance of doubt and to ensure a suitable form of development in accordance with Policy 8 of the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy.

### **3. Front Windows**

The proposed fenestrations sited to the front of the elevation shown in drawings number 18/9/1A must stay in perpetuated unless agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

**Reason:** To ensure a satisfactory appearance in the interests of visual amenity and promote a safe street through natural surveillance complying with Policy 8 of the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy.

### **4. North West Elevation**

Notwithstanding the provision of the Town and County Planning (General Permitted Development (England) Order 2015 (or any Order revoking and/or re-enacting that Order) no windows or other openings, other than those shown on the approved plans, shall at any time be placed in the side (north eastern facing) elevation. Of the development hereby permitted without the grants of a separate planning permission from the Local Planning Authority.

**Reason:** To ensure no adverse outlook is created on the neighbouring properties and to protect the character of the surrounding area in accordance with Policy 8 of the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy (2016).

## **10.0 Human Rights Act 1998**

Officers have considered the Human Rights Act 1998 in reaching a recommendation to grant planning permission, subject to conditions. Officers have considered the potential interference with the rights of the owners/occupiers of surrounding properties under Article 8/or Article 1 of the First Protocol of the Act and consider that it is appropriate.

Officers have also considered the interference with the human rights of the applicant under Article 8/and or Article 1 of the First Protocol caused by imposing conditions. Officers consider that the conditions are necessary to protect the rights and freedoms of others and to control the use of the property in accordance with the general interest. The interferences are therefore justifiable and proportional.

## **11.0 Section 17 of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998**

Officers have considered, with due regard, the likely effect of the proposal on the need to reduce crime and disorder as part of the determination of this application, in accordance with Section 17 of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998. In reaching a recommendation to grant planning permission.

### **Officers to Contact:**

Stuart Moseley

Tel No: 01536 464141

Email: [stuart.moseley@corby.gov.uk](mailto:stuart.moseley@corby.gov.uk)