

## Item No. 5.1

### Planning and EP Committee 16 May 2017

**Application Ref:** 17/00604/HHFUL

**Proposal:** Two storey side extension - resubmission

**Site:** 63 Peake Close, Woodston, Peterborough, PE2 9JE  
**Applicant:** Mr Quinton Roach

**Agent:** n/a  
**Referred by:** Cllr Seluca  
**Reason:** The extension would not adversely impact upon the amenities of the occupiers of the neighbouring residential properties

**Site visit:** 28.04.2017

**Case officer:** Mr M Roberts  
**Telephone No.** 01733 454410  
**E-Mail:** mike.roberts@peterborough.gov.uk

**Recommendation:** Refusal

---

---

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

### The site and surrounding area

The property comprises of a detached 2 bedroom dwelling within a spacious curtilage. It is set forward in the plot with its front elevation in alignment with the other dwellings within Peake Close. Its rear garden has a depth of 19m. The east facing side elevation of the dwelling is between 5.5m to 6m from the boundary that is shares with the dwellings at nos.1 and 2 Prospero Close. Nos.1 and 2 Prospero Close have garden depths of 7.5m and 8.1m respectively. The boundary separating the properties is a 1.8m high fence.

The area between the side elevation of the dwelling and the east flank boundary of the property of the application property used to be heavily overgrown with unmaintained bushes and trees. These have been removed and the east facing elevation of no.63 Peake is in clear view of the residents of those two dwellings.

### The proposal

The application is a revised proposal for the erection of a two storey side extension to the dwelling. This follows a delegated refusal of planning permission for a two storey side extension earlier in the year. The proposal is for a kitchen and a bedroom above.

The extension is to have a pitched roof, a ridge height, a gable end and a depth that would match those of the existing dwelling. The only change in the measurements of the revised extension compared to that of the refused extension is that the proposed width of the extension is to be 4m, reduced from 4.5m.

This means that the south-west corner of the extension would be 1.5m from the shared rear boundary of no.2 Prospero Close and the south-east corner of the extension would be 2m from the shared rear boundary with no.1 Prospero Close as opposed to the original proposal where the 4.5m width of the extension would have given rise to separation distances of between 1m to 1.5m from the same points of the extension.

The materials for the extension are to match those of the existing dwelling.

## **2 Planning History**

<b>Reference</b>	<b>Proposal</b>	<b>Decision</b>	<b>Date</b>
16/02364/HHFUL	Two storey side extension	Refused	17/02/2017

This application was refused planning permission on the grounds that:-

The proposed extension would, by reason of its height, size, mass and proximity to the east boundary of the site, result in an adverse overbearing and overshadowing impact upon the amenities of the occupiers of no.1 and no.2 Prospero Close. The proposal would therefore be contrary to Policy CS16 of the Peterborough Core Strategy and Policy PP3 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD.

## **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.

### **Peterborough Local Plan 2016 to 2036 (Preliminary Draft)**

This document sets out the planning policies against which development will be assessed. It will bring together all the current Development Plan Documents into a single document. Consultation on this document took place between December 2016 and 9 February 2017. The responses are currently being reviewed. At this preliminary stage only limited weight can be attached to the policies set out therein.

## **4 Consultations/Representations**

### **PCC Tree Officer**

No comments.

Cllr Seluca - In my opinion the extension should be approved as it will not have a significant adverse impact on the amenities of the neighbouring properties. The extension has been revised since the recent refusal and set in an extra half a metre. The distance between the proposed side wall of the extension and the neighbours property is sufficient to not be overbearing. Also the neighbours of this property are fully supportive.

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

Initial consultations: 7

Total number of responses: 0

Total number of objections: 0

Total number in support: 0

At the time of the preparation of this report the neighbour consultation period had not expired. No comments had been received from the occupiers of the close by dwellings. Should any comments be submitted these will be made known to the Committee in the update report.

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

### **The impact of the extension upon the amenities of the occupiers of close by residential properties**

The reason for the refusal of the original extension to the dwelling was the close proximity of its gable end to the rear boundary of dwellings at nos.1 and 2 Prospero Close. The separation distances are set out in section 1 of this report. The rear gardens of these dwellings are of a restricted depth such that the scale of the extension was considered to be significantly overbearing both within the rear gardens and within the conservatories of nos.1 and 2.

The revised proposal is identical in all aspects to the that of the previously refused extension other than the gable end of the extension being set back a further 0.5m from the shared boundaries of no.63 Peake Close and nos1 and 2 Prospero Close. Whilst this would increase the physical separation distances to the dwellings at nos.1 and 2 Prospero Close it is not considered sufficient to overcome the overbearing impact of the extensions when viewed from inside of the conservatories and from within the rear gardens of nos.1 and 2 Prospero Close.

### **The design of the extension**

In many cases for 2 storey side extensions to a dwelling it is necessary to set back the front elevation of the extensions to reduce the mass of the extension and to help to reduce a terracing effect within the street scene. However, in this case, given that the extension is to a detached dwelling there would be no terracing effect and given the width of the plot the extension would not dominate the existing dwelling or the street scene. Therefore the design of the extension is considered to be acceptable.

## **6 Conclusions**

This proposal is not considered to be in accordance with local and national planning policy and it has not been possible to identify solutions to the concerns as set out in this decision that the applicant agrees with.

## **7 Recommendation**

The Director of Growth and Regeneration recommends that Planning Permission is Refused.

- R 1 The revised extension would, by reason of its height, size, mass and proximity to the east boundary of the site, result in an adverse overbearing impact upon the amenities of the occupiers of no.1 and no.2 Prospero Close, both within their rear gardens and the conservatories of these dwellings. The proposal would therefore be contrary to Policy CS16 of the Peterborough Core Strategy and Policies PP2 and PP3 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD.