

**Application Ref:** 17/01833/FUL

**Proposal:** Construction of two-bed bungalow and access

**Site:** 22 Topham Crescent, Thorney, Peterborough, PE6 0SR  
**Applicant:** Mrs P Caudle

**Agent:** Mr John Hartley  
 J J & J Hartley

**Referred by:** Cllr Nigel Simons

**Reason:** Supports the application

**Site visit:** 28.09.2017

**Case officer:** Mrs J MacLennan  
**Telephone No.** 01733 454438  
**E-Mail:** janet.maclennan@peterborough.gov.uk

**Recommendation:** **REFUSE**

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

Site and surroundings

The application site is part of the garden area to no. 22 Topham Crescent and is rectangular in shape approximately 20m in length x 9.5m in width. The site lies adjacent to the rear garden of no. 5 Jamerstone Close to the north which is a bungalow and no. 24 Topham Close to the south, also a bungalow. The site abuts the Duke of Bedford Primary School to the rear. The site would be accessed directly off Topham Crescent. The surrounding area is predominantly residential in character comprising primarily single storey dwellings.

Proposal

The application seeks approval for the erection of a two bedroom bungalow with independent access and parking provision for at least 2 vehicles.

The red outline of the application site has increased since the initial submission and the garage has been deleted. Re-consultation has been undertaken.

**2 Planning History**

No relevant planning history

**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)**

**CS01 - Settlement Hierarchy and the Countryside**

The location/ scale of new development should accord with the settlement hierarchy. Development in the countryside will be permitted only where key criteria are met.

**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.

#### **PP04 - Amenity Provision in New Residential Development**

Proposals for new residential development should be designed and located to ensure that they provide for the needs of the future residents.

#### **PP12 - The Transport Implications of Development**

Permission will only be granted if appropriate provision has been made for safe access by all user groups and there would not be any unacceptable impact on the transportation network including highway safety.

#### **PP13 - Parking Standards**

Permission will only be granted if appropriate parking provision for all modes of transport is made in accordance with standards.

#### **PP16 - The Landscaping and Biodiversity Implications of Development**

Permission will only be granted for development which makes provision for the retention of trees and natural features which contribute significantly to the local landscape or biodiversity.

### **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 received

**Archaeological Officer** – No objection - The proposed development site and surrounding area contain no known heritage assets. Therefore, the archaeological potential of the site is considered to be low/unknown. On the basis of the available evidence the proposed development is unlikely to affect important buried remains. Therefore, there is no need to secure a programme of archaeological work.

**PCC Peterborough Highways Services** – No objections - The site frontage measures approximately 5.2m so the required access width of 3.5m with the 1.5m wide pedestrian splay to the south of the access can be provided on the site frontage edged in red. The pedestrian splay to the north of the access shall be located within blue land and therefore can be maintained by the applicant free from any obstruction over 600mm in perpetuity. A total of 2 on-site parking spaces for the development shall suffice. The proposed garage, to count towards parking provision, must measure 3m x 6m internally. The LHA would suggest that the proposed garage is increased in size and also that a parking space is provided to the north alongside the garage.

**North Level Drainage Board** - No comments to make on the application

**Thorney Parish Council** - No comments received

**Cllr Simons** - I have been contacted by the applicant and I have visited the neighbour. As per Thorney Parrish council, I also have no objections. I wish the application to be referred to Planning Committee.

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

Initial consultations: 5

Total number of responses: 1

Total number of objections: 0

Total number in support: 1

One letter has been received in support of the application stating:

- The proposed bungalow would be most suitable for the elderly
- New build small bungalows are a rarity

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

### The Principle of Development

The site lies within the village settlement boundary of Thorney where the principle of windfall development is supported under policy CS1 of the Adopted Peterborough Core Strategy DPD. The proposal would provide a new bungalow and would add to the City Council's much needed housing provision. The principle of development is acceptable subject to meeting the requirements of other relevant planning policy and material considerations.

### Design and Visual Amenity

The surrounding area comprises predominantly single storey residential development and therefore the scale and design of the dwelling would be in keeping with the surrounding character. However the site is part of the garden area of no. 22 Topham Crescent and a piece of land which provides a degree of separation to its neighbour at no. 24 Topham Crescent and no. 5 Jamerstone Close. Due to the alignment of the road the front elevation to no. 22 faces into its respective plot rather than fronting the street.

The application as initially submitted indicated the potential for a piece of land to be purchased from the neighbouring occupier at no. 24 Topham Crescent however this was not included within the red outline of the application. This has since been amended to include the extra land and re-consultation was undertaken. Whilst the additional land improves the space around the building it is considered that the development would not respect the layout and built form of development in the area.

The initial scheme also proposed a garage forward of the front elevation of the proposed dwelling. The applicant was advised to delete the garage as it would have been positioned forward of the building line which is uncharacteristic of development in the immediate area.

Concern was also raised regarding the proximity of the parking area to the host dwelling at no. 22 and the poor outlook for the occupants of this property. The scheme now proposes a 1.8m high fence, in part, between the two driveways to obscure views of the parked cars associated with the proposed dwelling. However, this is not considered to be characteristic of the development form in this location and would be detrimental to the street scene.

It would also result in an obscured view of the proposed dwelling from Topham Crescent. As such, unlike other properties within the street, it would have little frontage with the street.

The application would result in a significant reduction in available outdoor amenity space, albeit it is acknowledged that some of the dwellings nearby have small gardens.

In summary, the application site is not considered to be a development plot owing to its size, shape and relationship with surrounding properties. The proposal would not respect the form of development in the immediate area and spacing between properties and it would result in a contrived form of development that would appear at odds with the general character of this part of street. The proposal is therefore contrary to policy CS16 of the Adopted Peterborough Core Strategy DPD and policy PP2 of the Adopted Peterborough Planning Policies DPD.

#### Neighbouring Amenity

The dwelling would be set back within the site by some 14m. The front elevation of the dwelling would be situated approximately 3.5m from the host dwelling at no. 22. Due to the orientation of no. 22 facing into the site, cars associated with the new dwelling would be parked within 4.5m of the front elevation to number 22. This relationship is likely to cause noise and disturbance to the occupiers of the host dwelling due to the comings and goings, parking and manoeuvring of vehicles and level of activity, which would not be in the control of the occupants of No 22 and which would occur in close proximity to the front windows of the property.

This issue has been raised with the applicant and a revised plan has indicated the provision of a 1.8m high boundary fence of 9m in length to be positioned between the properties. Whilst this would screen the view of cars parking to the front of the dwelling, the fence would be a feature which is uncharacteristic to the frontage of properties and in addition would not provide an acceptable outlook for the future occupiers of the host dwelling.

Concern is also raised regarding the relationship with the property at no. 5 Jamerstone Close. The principle garden area to this property is south facing and has a depth of approximately 5.2m. There is currently a 1.8m high fence along the shared boundary with the application site which would currently overshadow part of the garden area. The proposed bungalow would be positioned approximately 6.7m from the rear elevation of no. 5 Jamerstone Close and would run in close proximity to, and along almost the whole length of, the rear garden of this neighbouring dwelling. It is acknowledged that the proposal is for a single storey property with a ridge height of 4m, however it is considered that there would be a very tight relationship with the neighbouring property at no. 5 Jamerstone Close which would be overbearing and which would result in some overshadowing to what is a relatively small garden area.

It is accepted that some of the dwellings have small gardens, for example, the relatively recent development in Jamerstone Close (ref. 11/02067/FUL) comprising bungalows with shallow gardens of some 5-6m however the relationship between these properties and existing development in Topham Close is such that separation distances between properties is acceptable, unlike the proposed application where the relationship with no. 5 Jamerstone Close would be much closer and would not be acceptable. The applicant has provided photographs of surrounding properties showing small gardens and this is not disputed.

The proposal would result in a contrived development which would not provide appropriate separation distance to the existing neighbouring development particularly, the host dwelling and overshadowing. It would also result in an overbearing impact on no. 5 Jamerstone Close. Hence the proposal is contrary to policy PP3 of the Adopted Peterborough Planning Policies DPD and policy CS16 of the Adopted Peterborough Core Strategy DPD.

#### Residential Amenity

The proposed dwelling would provide an acceptable level of amenity for the future occupiers. There would be a rear amenity area, all rooms would be served by natural lighting, there is an area for the storage of refuse bins and appropriate parking provisions would be provided.

The host dwelling would be left with a small garden area to the rear. Whilst the garden would be significantly smaller than is currently the case it would not be so unduly small as to make it unusable by occupiers; indeed in some cases a small garden is preferred. It would be unreasonable to refuse the application on this basis given that some of the dwellings in this location also have small garden areas.

The proposal would therefore accord with policy PP4 of the Adopted Peterborough Planning Policies DPD.

#### Highway Implications

The proposal includes a new access off Topham Crescent and parking provision for two cars. It is considered that an appropriate width of access with available visibility splays would be achievable. The visibility splay to the north of the access is within 'blue' land and a condition could be appended to ensure the visibility splay is retained in perpetuity. The access arrangements for the host dwelling would be unaffected.

The parking provision would accord with the parking standards under policy PP13 of the Adopted Peterborough Planning Policies DPD.

It is not considered that the proposal would result in any adverse impact on the safety of users of the public highway and hence the proposal accords with policies PP12 and PP13 of the Adopted Peterborough Planning Policies DPD.

A letter has been received in support of the proposal stating that bungalows are hard to come across and that it would be suitable for an elderly person. It is accepted that the proposal would provide a contribution to the City Councils housing supply, however this does not outweigh the harm that would be caused to the surrounding character and the amenity of neighbouring occupiers.

## **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 positioning of the dwelling with its close relationship with the host dwelling at number 22 Topham Crescent and to the neighbouring property at no. 24 Topham Crescent, including the erection of a 1.8m high fence, would result in a contrived development which would not respect the general layout, spacing and character of the development within this location. Hence the proposal would be contrary to policy CS16 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD and policy PP2 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD.
- R 2 The proposed boundary treatment to the front elevation of number 22 Topham Crescent would mitigate some of the noise and activity associated with the occupiers of the new dwelling. However this would result in a poor outlook and an unacceptable sense of enclosure for occupiers of the host dwelling. Hence the proposal is contrary to policy CS16 of the Adopted Peterborough Core Strategy DPD and policy PP3 of the Adopted Peterborough Planning Policies DPD.
- R 3 The proposed dwelling would be positioned close to the neighbouring property at no. 5 Jamerstone Close. The proximity of the proposed dwelling and the relatively shallow depth of this neighbouring garden, along with its south facing aspect, would result in overshadowing

and an overbearing impact to the occupiers of this neighbouring dwelling. Hence the proposal would be contrary to policy CS16 of the Adopted Peterborough Core Strategy DPD and policy PP3 of the Adopted Peterborough Planning Policies DPD.