

**Application Ref:** 12/01062/HHFUL

**Proposal:** Construction of two storey side , conversion of garage to habitable space and single storey rear extension

**Site:** 19 Plough Lane, Newborough, Peterborough, PE6 7SR

**Applicant:** Miss Jane Mann

**Agent:**

**Referred by:** Cllr Harrington

**Reason:** In the wider public interest

**Site visit:** 01.08.2012

**Case officer:** Mr S Falco

**Telephone No.** 01733 454408

**E-Mail:** sam.falco@peterborough.gov.uk

**Recommendation:** REFUSE

## 1 Description of the site and surroundings and Summary of the proposal

### **Site Description:**

The site consists of a two storey detached property, built circa late 1990's on a modern estate in Newborough. The dwelling has light red brick elevations, white upvc windows and doors and a terracotta coloured pantile roof.

### **Proposal:**

Planning permission is sought for the construction of a two storey side extension, the conversion of the existing garage into habitable space and a single storey extension to link the proposed side extension with the converted garage. The two storey side extension measures 2.6m (Width) x 8.5m (Depth) with a ridge and eaves height the same as the existing dwelling. The single storey link element measures 3m (width) x 1.8m (depth) with an eaves height of 2.3m and a ridge height of 3.3m, matching that of the existing garage.

## 2 Planning History

Reference	Proposal	Decision	Date
99/00750/FUL	Erection of detached garage	Application Permitted	04/08/1999

## 3 Planning Policy

Decisions must be taken in accordance with the development plan polices below, unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

### **National Planning Policies**

#### **Paragraph 56:**

The Government attaches great importance to the design of the built environment. Good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, is indivisible from good planning, and should contribute positively to making places better for people.

#### **Paragraph 60:**

Planning policies and decisions should not attempt to impose architectural styles or particular tastes and they should not stifle innovation, originality or initiative through unsubstantiated

requirements to conform to certain development forms or styles. It is, however, proper to seek to promote or reinforce local distinctiveness.

## **Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011)**

### **CS16 - Urban Design and the Public Realm**

Design should be of high quality, appropriate to the site and area, improve the public realm, address vulnerability to crime, be accessible to all users and not result in any unacceptable impact upon the amenities of neighbouring residents.

## **4 Consultations/Representations**

### **Parish Council (17.07.12)**

No objections

### **North Level District Internal Drainage Board**

No comments received

### **Local Residents/Interested Parties**

Initial consultations: 4

Total number of responses: 2

Total number of objections: 1

Total number in support: 0

One letter of objection received raising the following planning issues:

Our home is a two bedroom bungalow with a conservatory attached, the extension will:

- Have an overbearing impact
- Overshadow our conservatory, causing a loss of natural daylight and sunlight
- Cause a loss of privacy
- The proposal will exceed the current building line

The second response was received from the Parish Council who stated they had no objections to the proposal.

### **Cllr Harrington**

I am in favour of supporting this application for the following reasons;

Ms Mann has lived in the village for her whole life, her father a widower lives nearby and her late mother is buried in the church graveyard. Ms Mann's brother and his family also live in the village. The applicant's children attend Newborough School.

This application for an extension to the existing dwelling is based on the needs of the applicant to be able to provide more space for her growing family, extra bedrooms etc.

Ms Mann wants to remain close to her family who all live nearby. She has looked at properties as they became available within the village, which might have suited her needs, but found the cost of these, in most cases, above her range in price.

I do think it is important that we try and support families who want to live and remain close to their extended families, which in turn helps greatly with the sustainability of our rural communities.

## **5 Assessment of the planning issues**

### **1 Character and Appearance:**

1.1 The host dwelling is located to the bottom of a cul-de-sac and is visible from a significant distance when driving along Plough Lane. The immediate streetscene is that of 2 bulky detached two storey dwellings to the left (no's 15 & 17), then the host property which forms a more modest two storey dwelling with a side driveway and then to the right a bungalow (no.21).

1.2 The proposed extensions will be located on the existing driveway to the side of the house and will effectively fill the gap between the host dwelling and the bungalow. It is

considered that the side extension will cause significant detriment to the character and appearance of the area by way of an odd juxtaposition between a small and large scale property in such close proximity.

1.3 In addition, it is felt that the architectural design of the existing property does not lend itself to a harmonious extension due to the lack of a prominent and principle feature that a side extension can be designed against.

1.4 The conversion of the garage and the link extension from the rear of the side extension to the garage will not be visible from the public realm and will therefore have no impact on the character and appearance of the area.  
However, the proposal, when assessed as a whole, for reasons of its odd juxtaposition and dominating appearance with the neighbouring bungalow at no.21 and resultant detriment to the character and appearance of the area is considered to be contrary to Paragraphs 56 and 60 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2012 and Policy CS16 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD 2011.

## **2 Neighbour Amenity:**

2.1 The proposal is located to the side of the dwelling and will effectively run the entire length of the neighbouring bungalow. The west elevation of the bungalow has no windows and therefore the proposal is unlikely to have any considerable overshadowing impact on the main house.

2.2 When stood in the north facing conservatory of the neighbouring property, it is apparent that at certain times of the afternoon and evening it benefits from sunlight that comes between driveway of the application dwelling and then west across the rear of the garden of the application property.  
The overshadowing upon the conservatory is likely to be caused by both the two storey element and the single storey link from the back of the extension to the converted garage.

2.3 It is prudent to note that a single storey side extension that projects off the rear of the proposed two storey element is not considered to cause significant levels of overshadowing as the main dwelling sits directly behind and is of considerably larger scale.

2.4 The two storey side element is deemed to cause the issue of overbearing and overshadowing on the amenity of the occupiers of the bungalow (no.21), specifically the conservatory. The two storey side extension extends the whole depth of the house and projects 500mm off the rear wall of the original house. Having visited the bungalow at no.21 in the middle of the afternoon, it was apparent that the proposal was likely to block natural sunlight from the rear conservatory at certain points of the day. It is considered by the LPA that the conservatory, being north facing does not benefit from considerable levels of natural sunlight and the small windows of sunlight that it does benefit from are of importance to the amenity of the occupiers of no.21.

2.5 On balance, it is deemed that the proposed extensions and in particular the first floor element on the site will cumulatively increase the impact on neighbour amenity to an unacceptable level, in terms of overshadowing and therefore this proposal is deemed to be contrary to relevant sections of Policy CS16 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD 2011.

## **3 Consultation Responses:**

3.1 The objection received has been carefully considered and the proposals have been carefully assessed from the most affected property. The reasons of objection including; Overbearing, Overshadowing, Loss of natural daylight, loss of privacy and exceeding the current house line have been carefully assessed. It is considered that as there are no windows in the side elevation the objection in relation to loss of privacy is not founded. The comment with regards to exceeding the house line, this is to the rear and as such will not have significant impact on the character and appearance of the area; however this has formed part of the assessment of neighbour amenity.

## **6 Conclusions**

The proposal is unacceptable having been assessed in light of all material considerations, including weighing against relevant policies of the development plan and for the specific reasons given below.

## **7 Recommendation**

The Head of Planning, Transport and Engineering Services recommends that planning permission is **REFUSED**

- R 1 The proposal, by reason of its odd juxtaposition and dominating appearance set alongside a neighbouring bungalow at no.21 Plough Lane would have a harmful impact on the character and appearance of the area. The proposal is therefore considered contrary to Paragraphs 56 and 60 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2012 and Policy CS16 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD 2011.
- R 2 The proposed extensions on the site will cumulatively increase the impact on neighbour amenity to an unacceptable level in terms of overshadowing. As a result, this proposal is deemed to be contrary to Policy CS16 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD 2011.

Copy to Councillor D N Harrington