

Application Ref: 14/01759/HHFUL

Proposal: Garage extension

Site: 8 Engaine, Orton Longueville, Peterborough, PE2 7QA
Applicant: Mr J Bowden

Agent: Sharman Architecture

Referred by: **Head of Planning Services**
Reason: An objector is related to a Planning Officer
Site visit: 05.11.2014

Case officer: Mr D Jolley
Telephone No. 01733 453414
E-Mail: david.jolley@peterborough.gov.uk

Recommendation: **REFUSE**

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

Site and surroundings

The site is a detached corner plot dwelling of brick and tile construction in a residential cul de sac location. The dwelling was previously extended under application number 13/01482/HHFUL; this application approved substantial increases in the size of the dwelling, permitting a full width two storey rear extension and single storey side extension. The dwelling has a large side/rear garden enclosed by a combination of hedging and brick wall.

N.B. Consent for a double garage located immediately north of the dwelling was given under application number 14/01215/HHFUL.

Proposal

Permission is sought for the erection of a garage to the east of the dwelling measuring 6.6 metres wide by 6.15 metres deep with a dual pitch roof measuring 2.4 metres above ground level at the eaves and 5.5 metres at the apex.

2 Planning History

Reference	Proposal	Decision	Date
13/01482/HHFUL	Alterations and extension to dwelling and creation of a new access - resubmission	Permitted	06/12/2013
14/01215/HHFUL	Erection of detached garage	Permitted	10/09/2014

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

Orton Longueville Parish Council

No comments received

Landscape Officer (24.11.14)

No objections

Local Residents/Interested Parties

Initial consultations: 5

Total number of responses: 5

Total number of objections: 5

Total number in support: 0

Five objections have been received in relation to the proposal;

Block plan is inaccurate - This has now been resolved.

Description is misleading it is not an extension.

Rebuilt house is much larger than others in Engaine.

Garage is too high and higher than neighbouring garages.

Garage is in a prominent location, will change the character of the area.

Loss of trees will exacerbate the impact of the garage.

Would be in front of the building line

Driveway materials are not specified, garage and driveway may lead to flooding.

5 Assessment of the planning issues

The main considerations are;

- The impact of the proposal on the character of the area
- The impact of the proposal on the amenity of the occupiers of neighbouring dwellings
- Other matters

The impact of the proposal on the character of the area

The Local Planning Authority consider that the application site is the most prominent site within the cul de sac, as it is directly in front of all visitors who travel by car into the street. The site is therefore more sensitive than other sites within the street. The garage would have a large expanse of roof measuring 5.5 metres in height, which would be clearly visible above the boundary hedge and wall and also forward of the building line created by the bungalow to the north. As such the position and size of the garage would in the opinion of the LPA, cause it to appear overly dominant and incongruous within the streetscene, blocking views of the host dwelling and neighbouring dwellings as one moves around the cul de sac, to the detriment of the character of the area.

It is also considered that the garage is too remote from the host dwelling. The majority of garages within the cul de sac are close to or attached to the host dwellings. The applicant has submitted examples of other taller garages within the cul de sac as justification for the proposal. Whilst the LPA accept there are other large garages, this does not mean that the proposal is acceptable by way of precedent. Engaine contains a varied style of dwellings and plot size/locations and each proposal must be judged on its merits. The LPA do not consider either of the examples submitted by the applicant to be particularly successful designs but they are at least close to the host dwellings and therefore have a better relationships when compared to this proposal whose remoteness to the host dwelling is also considered to further exacerbate the detriment to the character of the area.

The revisions by the applicant go some way to addressing this issue, however the alterations are not considered to be enough to overcome officer concerns and for the application to be recommended for approval.

The LPA has put forward what it considers to be a reasonable solution, which gives the applicant a large garage, with useable storage above, but reduces the impact on the streetscene. This solution involves reducing the height of the garage by 0.5 metres and moving it further from the boundary. In effect swapping the locations of the turning area and the garage. This would place the garage closer to the dwelling, allowing it to relate much better to the host dwelling as the other garages in Engaine do, and greatly reducing its prominence. However the applicant does not wish to move forward with this solution.

It should also be noted that there is an extant permission for a double garage, given under application number 14/01215/HHFUL.

In light of the above, the proposal is considered contrary to policy CS16 of the Peterborough Core Strategy (DPD) and policy PP2 of the Peterborough Planning Policies (DPD) 2012.

The impact of the proposal on the amenity of the occupiers of neighbouring dwellings

The garage is located approximately 8.0 metres from the closest neighbour. This is considered to be sufficiently far as to ensure that no overshadowing or overbearing impact would result.

There is no reason to believe that the garage, or the use of the garage would result in unacceptable disturbance to the amenity of the occupiers of neighbouring dwellings.

Other matters

Objectors have raised concerns regarding the drainage of the garage and the potential impermeability of the turning area/driveway. As the garage is over 30sqm internally it would require building regulations approval. Drainage issues would need to be addressed as part of this process.

A condition could be appended to any permission requiring that the driveway be permeable, or that other forms of drainage be provided. This is considered adequate to mitigate risk of flooding issues.

Objectors have stated that the description is misleading. Whilst the LPA agree the proposal would be better described simply as a garage, there can be no doubt what is proposed if the plans are viewed.

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 garage, by way of its height and location, would be an unacceptably dominant and incongruous focal point within the street scene, to the detriment of the character of the area. This is contrary to policy CS16 of the Peterborough Core Strategy (DPD) 2011 and policy PP2 of the Peterborough Planning Policies (DPD) 2012 which state;

CS16 - New development should respond appropriately to the particular character of its site and surroundings

PP2 - Planning Permission would only be given for development which makes a positive contribution to the quality of the built environment and would not have a detrimental effect on the surrounding area

Copies to Councillors G Casey, L Forbes