

**North Northamptonshire Area Planning Committee  
(Thrapston)  
3 May 2022**

<b>Application Reference</b>	<b>NE/21/01807/FUL</b>
<b>Case Officer</b>	<b>Jacqui Colbourne</b>
<b>Location</b>	<b>10 Burystead Rise Raunds Wellingborough North Northamptonshire NN9 6RZ</b>
<b>Development</b>	<b>Single storey rear extension</b>
<b>Applicant</b>	<b>Alison Bailey</b>
<b>Agent</b>	<b>Blueprint Architectural Design - Kelly</b>
<b>Ward</b>	<b>Raunds</b>
<b>Overall Expiry Date</b>	<b>29.03.2022</b>
<b>Agreed Extension of Time</b>	<b>09.05.2022</b>

**Scheme of Delegation**

This application is brought to committee because it falls outside of the Council's Scheme of Delegation because the Officer recommendation is contrary to the Town Council's objection, which cannot be resolved.

**1. Recommendation**

---

- 1.1 That planning permission be GRANTED subject to conditions.

**2. The Proposal**

---

- 2.1 The application proposes the erection of a single storey rear extension to provide a living room and games room. Due the internal reconfigurations, the proposal would result in one additional downstairs bedroom.

### **3. Site Description**

---

- 3.1 The application relates to a two storey, detached dwellinghouse which is surrounded by similar aged properties in a variety of designs within a residential area of Raunds. The land level slopes down to the north of the site and the neighbouring sites. The land level of No. 8 is estimated to be approx. 1 metre lower than the application site and No.12 is approx. 1 metre higher.

### **4. Relevant Planning History**

---

- 4.1 None.

### **5. Consultation Responses**

---

A full copy of all comments received can be found on the Council's website [here](#)

#### **5.1 Raunds Town Council**

Raunds Town Council object to the development. Consider this to be an overdevelopment of the site and not in keeping with the area. As the road is on a slope it gives the impression of it being taller than designed and will affect the neighbour's right to light. The plans appear to measure 6.065m which is in excess of the 6m permitted development.

#### **5.2 Neighbours / Responses to Publicity**

Three letters of objection have been received. Material planning issues raised are summarised below:

- Scale;
- Design and visual impact;
- Impact on light; and
- Parking

Non-material planning matters raised are summarised below:

- Concerns that this will be a separate residential unit; and
- Subsidence

These matters cannot be given weight. The application is for householder development and not for a separate residential unit. The application needs to be assessed on the basis of what is being applied for, not on the basis of concerns of what it may become. Concerns about subsidence are civil / building regulations matters.

### 5.3 Natural England

Natural England is not able to fully assess the potential impacts of this proposal on statutory nature conservation sites or protected landscapes or, provide detailed advice on the application. If you consider there are significant risks to statutory nature conservation sites or protected landscapes, please set out the specific areas on which you require advice. The lack of detailed advice from Natural England does not imply that there are no impacts on the natural environment. It is for the local authority to determine whether or not the proposal is consistent with national and local environmental policies. Other bodies and individuals may provide information and advice on the environmental value of this site and the impacts of the proposal on the natural environment to assist the decision-making process.

### 5.4 Community Development

No comments received.

### 5.5 Ecology

No comments received.

## **6. Relevant Planning Policies and Considerations**

---

### 6.1 Statutory Duty

Planning law requires that applications for planning permission must be determined in accordance with the Development Plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

### 6.2 National Policy

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2021)  
National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG)  
National Design Guide (NDG) (2019)

### 6.3 North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy (JCS) (2016)

Policy 1 - Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development  
Policy 8 - North Northamptonshire Place Shaping Principles

### 6.4 Emerging East Northamptonshire Local Plan (LPP2) (2021)

EN1 – Spatial Development Strategy

### 6.5 Raunds Neighbourhood Plan (made 2017)

Policy R2 - Promoting good design

### 6.6 Other Relevant Documents

Local Highway Authority Parking Standards (2016)  
Householder Extensions Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) -  
(Adopted June 2020)

## 7. Evaluation

---

The key issues for consideration are:

- Visual Impact
- Impact on Amenity
- Highway Matters

### 7.1 Visual Impact

7.1.1 The proposed extension would be partially visible from Burystead Rise through the opening between Nos. 8 and 10. However it is noted that the single storey proposal would only extend to the rear by 0.65 metres beyond what could be erected under permitted development. The proposal would be set away from the northern boundary with No.8 by 1 metre, therefore not infilling the existing gap between these two properties and maintaining a side access to the rear of the property; this is in accordance with the Householder Extensions SPD (2020). The gap between the existing property and No.12 is approximately 0.94 metres and whilst this is very slightly less than recommended by the Householder Extensions SPD, it would be in line with the existing dwellinghouse. Furthermore No.12 is in an elevated position when compared to No.10 and therefore this would reduce the impact on this neighbouring property.

7.1.2 In terms of design this proposal would be sympathetic to the existing dwelling house and not dissimilar to the various alterations and extensions to the rear of several properties on Burystead Rise. It is proposed to have a cream render finish which would be complementary given the existing cream rendered elements to the host dwelling. The roof tiles and UPVC Rosewood windows would match the existing property; all the proposed materials could be secured via planning condition.

7.1.3 This element of the proposal is therefore considered acceptable.

### 7.2 Impact on Amenity

7.2.1 It is noted that the neighbouring property at No.12 is set down from No.10 by approx.1 metre, whilst noting the difference in land levels, this proposed extension would not dominate the view from the back garden of No.12 in a manner that is considered to be oppressive or overbearing. The proposed rear extension would be single storey and drawings have been submitted which demonstrate that the proposal does not breach the 60 degree line with neighbouring properties at No.12 or No.8; the proposal is therefore compliant with the Householder Extensions SPD in terms of its impact on light to the neighbouring properties.

- 7.2.2 Whilst the proposed extension would be 3.462 metres in overall height, it is proposed to be constructed with a double pitched roof to reduce its height and as a result its height nearest the boundary would be only 2.447 metres; its overall proposed depth is 6.065 metres. It is noted that given this is a detached property under extended permitted development a rear extension of up to 8 metres in depth and 4 metres in height could be constructed. Given this, it is not considered that the proposed extension would have an unacceptable increase on overbearing on the neighbouring properties. Furthermore, as no windows are proposed to either the north or south elevations there would be no additional overlooking impact from these proposals.
- 7.2.3 No.8 to the north is set down from No.10. The proposed extension would be located more than 1 metre from the boundary with number 8, in line with the Householder Extensions SPD (2020). Whilst noting the difference in land levels of approx. 1 metre this proposed extension would not dominate the view from the back garden of No.8 in a manner that is considered to be oppressive or overbearing. In addition, whilst the proposal is set slightly closer to the boundary with No.12, (0.94 metres) given the path of the sun, and that this neighbouring property is set above No. 10 and to the south of this proposal it would not result in an unacceptable additional impact on light to No.12.
- 7.2.4 Satisfactory amenity space serving this dwelling would remain as a result of these proposals and as such is not considered to be an overdevelopment of the site as raised as a concern by the Town Council.
- 7.2.5 This element of the proposal is therefore considered acceptable.

### 7.3 Highway Matters

- 7.3.1 The application site provides off road parking in front of the property for more than three vehicles and these are in accordance with Highways Parking Standards (2016). Whilst the comments from the public are noted with regard to adequate off road parking, the proposal is not for an additional dwelling and therefore cannot be assessed as such, this proposal does not result in a requirement for additional off road parking provision, as such, on balance, the off road parking provision is considered acceptable.

## 8. Other Matters

---

- 8.1 Neighbour comments: Concerns relating to the impact on light, scale, potential overbearing and parking have been addressed above. Whilst concerns that this will be a separate residential unit are noted the application is not for a separate unit of accommodation and this was shown on the original plans submitted. It is noted that the amended plans do not show a separate unit of accommodation, and this can be secured via planning condition. In addition, the concerns around potential subsidence are not a planning consideration. Should the property be converted in to two residential units, a further planning application would be required, and the impact of an additional dwelling would be considered at that stage.

- 8.2 Equality Act 2010: It is not considered that the proposal raises any concerns in relation to the Equality Act (2010).
- 8.3 Raunds Town Council comments: The Town Council objects as further to their previous objections; they consider the proposal to be an overdevelopment of the site and not in keeping with the area. They observe that as the road is on a slope it gives the impression of being taller than designed and will affect the neighbour's right to light. The plans appear to measure 6.065m which is in excess of the 6m permitted development. However, this proposal is set 1 metre away from the boundary with No.8 and does not breach the 60 degree line. In addition, these concerns have been addressed in paragraphs 7.1.1 to 7.1.3, 7.2.1 to 7.2.5 and 7.3.1 above. On balance Officers consider the application to be acceptable in these regards.

## **9. Conclusion / Planning Balance**

---

- 9.1 Overall, the proposal is considered to be of an acceptable design, and there is no adverse impact on the amenities of neighbouring properties or the highway which would justify refusing the application.

## **10. Recommendation**

---

- 10.1 That Planning Permission be GRANTED subject to conditions.

## **11. Conditions**

---

- 1 The development permitted shall be begun before the expiration of 3 years from the date of this permission.

Reason: To comply with the provisions of Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, as amended.

- 2 Except where otherwise stipulated by condition, the application shall be carried out strictly in accordance with the following:

Application form

Existing Site Location & Proposed Block Plan Dwg 21-183-09

Received by this council 06.01.2022

Proposed Elevations Option 3 Dwg 21-183-08 B

Received by this council 01.02.2022

Proposed Ground Floor Plan Option 4 Dwg 21-183-10B

Received by this council 17.03.2022.

Reason: In order to clarify the terms of the Planning Permission and to ensure that the development is carried out as permitted.

- 3 The development hereby permitted shall be carried out using materials detailed in the submitted application form and plans.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity.

- 4 The living accommodation hereby approved shall be used only in association with, and ancillary to, the occupation of the existing dwelling at 10 Burystead Rise, and shall not be used as a separate dwelling unit.

Reason: In order to safeguard the amenity of adjacent residential properties and the character of the area.

- 5 Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (or any Order amending or re-enacting that Order with or without modification), no windows or doors (other than those expressly authorised by this consent which are detailed on the approved drawings) shall be added to the north elevation of the extension hereby approved.

Reason: In the interests of neighbouring amenity.