

Application Ref: 14/01167/HHFUL

Proposal: Proposed two storey rear extension, detached gymnasium/store, new front wall and new rear fence

Site: 204 Dogsthorpe Road, Peterborough, PE1 3PB,
Applicant: Mr Z Mehmood

Agent: Mr N P Branston mrics
 Branston Assoc.

Referred by: **Cllr Peach**

Reason: The applicant is very short of living accommodation, and I am not sure residential amenity would be lost if granted.

Site visit: 14.08.2014

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 comprises of a 2 Storey semi-detached, early 20th C property, with a wide driveway and timber detached garage positioned at its side. The site is located on the main road of Dogsthorpe Road.

Proposal:

The proposal consists of four separate elements:

- 1) A two storey rear extension to the main property, measuring 5.6m (projection) x 3.3m (width), with a flat roof measuring 5.5m in height.
- 2) The removal of the timber garage to the side of the property and construction of a wall and gates 5m from the back of the public highway, allowing for 2no cars to be parked clear of the public highway on the driveway. The proposed wall to the side of the house, measures 2m at its highest point. In addition to the above, a replacement wall is proposed to the front of the dwelling enclosing the small front garden, measuring 2m in height.
- 3) Erection of a detached outbuilding to the bottom of the garden, for uses ancillary to the main dwelling. The outbuilding is located in the far south east corner of the plot, adjacent to the rear boundary walls. The outbuilding is proposed to measure 6.6m (width) x 8m (depth), with an eaves height of 2.8m and 3.6m to the ridge.
- 4) Replacement of the fence that extends along the boundary between 202 and 204 Dogsthorpe Road. The fence is proposed to be 1.8m in height with a timber trellis up to a height of 2.4m.

2 Planning History

Reference	Proposal	Decision	Date
13/00721/HHFUL	Proposed single storey rear extension, detached gymnasium/store, new front wall and new rear fence	Permitted	18/07/2013

3 Planning Policy

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

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.

Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012)

PP02 - Design Quality

Permission will only be granted for development which makes a positive contribution to the built and natural environment; does not have a detrimental effect on the character of the area; is sufficiently robust to withstand/adapt to climate change; and is designed for longevity.

PP03 - Impacts of New Development

Permission will not be granted for development which would result in an unacceptable loss of privacy, public and/or private green space or natural daylight; be overbearing or cause noise or other disturbance, odour or other pollution; fail to minimise opportunities for crime and disorder.

4 Consultations/Representations

Victoria Park Residents Association

No comments received

Local Residents/Interested Parties

Initial consultations: 9

Total number of responses: 3

Total number of objections: 3

Total number in support: 0

3 letters of objection have been received.

Representation 1:

The 2 storey extension will overlook and overshadow my garden to the rear of the site, affecting my privacy.

Representation 2:

The proposed upper floor window will overlook my property to the rear of the site. The window is larger than that existing and will be positioned several metres closer to the boundary. I also object to the garden building, as it is excessively high and will block light from the corner of my garden.

Representation 3:

Objection to the two storey extension as it would overlook my property.

5 **Assessment of the planning issues**

a) **Background information:**

Planning permission was granted under planning reference 13/00721/HHFUL for a:-

- single storey rear extension to the property;
- a large garden building, and
- walls and fences

Subsequent to this approval, pre application discussions took place with the applicant, relating to additional development now proposed under this current application. The applicant was advised that the additional development was not considered to be acceptable, due to the significant detrimental impact that would result to the character and appearance of the area, and neighbouring residential amenity.

b) **Character and Appearance:**

Whilst the proposed two storey, flat roof rear extension would not be visible from the surrounding streetscene, it would form a visually poor addition to the property by way of its size, two storey height and flat roof nature, which would not in keeping with the character and proportions of the existing house. Generally two storey flat roof extensions are rarely acceptable, even on the rear elevations of property's, as their flat roofs are so visually at odds with the host property they adjoin, whose two storey accommodation is contained within a pitched roof structure.

The new walls/railings proposed to the front elevation of the dwelling under the previously approved application was reduced in height to achieve an acceptable appearance in the streetscene. The boundary wall and railing now proposed under this application have increased in height again to 2m height, the height that was deemed to be unacceptable under the previous application. A 2m wall/railings around the small front garden in front of the house and adjacent to the public footpath is deemed would appear out of character with the other lower height boundary treatments in the area, and be an incongruous feature in the streetscene, to its visual detriment, due to the height and appearance.

The 2m high wall proposed to the side of the property is considered to be acceptable because it would be positioned 5 metres from the back of the public highway, and set behind the front elevation of the property. Its visual dominance in the streetscene would therefore be significantly reduced, from that of a front boundary treatment and it would appear in keeping with the scale of the property, and form a secure line for the rear garden area.

The rear detached outbuilding is proposed at the height and width that was previously considered acceptable and approved under application ref: 13/00721/HHFUL and therefore has extant permission. It is not considered that the outbuilding would detract from the character and appearance of the area.

The proposals set out above, specifically the 2 storey flat roof rear extension and the 2m high front boundary wall/railings are considered to be significantly detrimental to the character and appearance of host property and the surrounding area, contrary to CS16 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD 2011 and PP02 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD 2012.

c) **Area / Neighbour Amenity:**

The previously approved planning permission (ref: 13/00721/HHFUL) comprised of a single storey rear extension with a projection of 5.6m from the rear elevation of the

property along the adjoining side boundary with No.202, which was deemed, on balance, to be acceptable. The currently proposed 5.6m projection of a two storey flat roof extension along the adjoining side boundary with No.202, under this application, is deemed to be wholly unacceptable due to the significant detrimental effect by way of its overbearing and overshadowing impacts on the residential amenity of the occupiers of no. 202 Dogsthorpe Road. Due to the original design of no.202 and 204 with significant 2 storey rear projections, the space in between them, where this extension is proposed to be positioned is absolutely critical in retaining an acceptable level of light to the rear French doors of no.202, adjacent to the proposed extension. Furthermore, the bulk of the previously permitted garden building, in addition to the proposed two storey 5.6m extension to the house, would result in a very overbearing impact on no.202 Dogsthorpe Road.

The applicant proposes the 2 storey extension because he requires more living space for his family. The proposed extension does not propose to increase the number of bedrooms for the property. The existing 4 bedroom property would remain a 4 bedroom property, but the additional first floor accommodation would allow the 4th bedroom to be extended to in excess of 9m in length. At ground floor as per the previously approved application, the property would have a sequence of 3no. linked living rooms on the ground floor from the front to the rear of the property. If further bedroom accommodation were required the applicant could consider the option of using some of the ground floor accommodation which is extremely generously proportioned in space terms in comparison to many 4 bedroom properties. In this instance it is considered the applicant's need for additional accommodation could not outweigh the resulting harm that would be caused to the residential amenity of neighbouring properties.

The 2m wall/railings to the side of the property, to secure the rear garden are deemed acceptable, and would not result in any adverse impact. However, the wall proposed to the small front garden of the property is considered detrimental to the visual amenity of the area, by way of creating an excessively tall and harsh boundary treatments along the back of the footpath, which is out of keeping with the character of the area.

The proposed outbuilding is the same size and height as the previously approved application and is considered to be acceptable in terms of its relationship with the surrounding neighbouring sites. This outbuilding also has an existing extant planning permission for this structure, by virtue of the previously approved consent, reference13/00721/HHFUL.

The proposed replacement fence along the boundary between 202 and 204 is proposed at 1.8m with a 600mm high trellis above, measuring a total height of 2.4m above ground level. This is considered to be too high for a residential boundary fence and would add to the overbearing impact on no.202 when considered together with the garden building and 2 storey rear extension positioned hard up against this adjoining side boundary. The height of this boundary fence under the previous permission was conditioned to be a maximum height of 2.2m in height and it is considered that is still the maximum height that would be acceptable for this boundary treatment.

In light of the above assessment, it is considered the proposed development would be detrimental to the residential amenity of neighbours and the amenity of the area and so would be contrary to Policy CS16 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD 2011 and PP03 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD 2012.

d) Highways:

The proposal would retain the adequate space on site for two cars to be parked clear of the public highway. The existing vehicle access to the site would also be retained. The proposal is therefore considered to be in accordance with Policy PP12 and PP13 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD 2012.

e) **Representations:**

Objections have been received from a number of residents on Garton End Road, their rear boundaries back on to the application site. They have unanimously stated that the resulting overlooking impact from the 2 storey extension will cause a harmful impact on their residential amenity. Whilst the proposed extension would result in additional views into the rear of the properties backing on to the site, it is deemed that the approximate 23m separation distance between first floor windows, would on balance result in an acceptable relationship between these sites. There will also be about a 12m separation from the rear window of the proposed extension to the start of the nearest garden. Therefore the additional impact of overlooking from that that presently exists on site, is not deemed to be significant, or to warrant a refusal of planning permission.

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 Director of Growth and Regeneration recommends that Planning Permission is **REFUSED**

- R 1 The proposed two storey flat roof rear extension fails to respect or reflect the design, character and proportions of the host dwelling, resulting in an unacceptable adverse visual impact on the site and surrounding area. As such, the proposal is deemed contrary to Planning CS16 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD 2011 and PP02 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD 2012.
- R 2 The proposed two storey rear extension by virtue of its siting, size and height, positioned on the adjoining boundary with No.202 would result in an unacceptable overshadowing, and overbearing impact on the residential amenities of the occupiers of this neighbouring site. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies CS16 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD 2011 and PP02 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD 2012.
- R 3 The 2m high wall to be positioned around the perimeter of the small front garden area is deemed to be too high for a front boundary wall, which abuts the highway in this residential context, and would result in an incongruous and alien feature to the visual detriment of the site and surrounding streetscene. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy CS16 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD 2011 and Policy PP02 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD 2012.

Copy to Councillors J Shearman and J P Peach

This page is intentionally left blank