

## Item No. 2

### Planning and EP Committee 6 November 2018

<b>Application Ref:</b>	18/01129/HHFUL
<b>Proposal:</b>	Demolition of existing double garage and utility room, erection of two storey extension to east elevation, erection of double timber car port and store to front, extensions to barn to the rear of site
<b>Site:</b>	Mouse Cottage, 1 North Fen Road, Glington, Peterborough
<b>Applicant:</b>	Mr Ian Hopkins
<b>Agent:</b>	n/a
<b>Referred by:</b>	Glington Parish Council
<b>Reason:</b>	Extension too large in relation to the house and Conservation Area, the forward positioning of the car port, the need for the barn works, inappropriate materials.
<b>Site visit:</b>	15.08.2018
<b>Case officer:</b>	Mr Jack Gandy
<b>Telephone No.</b>	01733 452595
<b>E-Mail:</b>	jack.gandy@peterborough.gov.uk
<b>Recommendation:</b>	<b>GRANT</b> subject to relevant conditions

---

---

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

### Site and Surroundings

The application site comprises a detached property located within the Glington Conservation Area. The dwelling is an amalgamation of former cottages and has a building footprint that is perpendicular to dwellings within the surrounding area. As such, the principal elevation of the plot is east-facing. The linear plot allows for a sizeable rear garden, on-site parking provision and access. The form of the surrounding area indicates two storey detached properties located on large plots. There are Grade II Listed dwellings within the surrounding area, however, none of the adjacent neighbours are Listed buildings. The Grade I St Benedict's Church is located to the south of the application site.

### Proposal

Planning permission is sought for the demolition of the existing flat roof double garage and utility room, the erection of a two storey side extension; a double carport building and store to the front of site, and the conversion and extension of the barn to the rear of site.

i) Two storey extension - The proposed two storey side extension would be constructed on the east elevation of the dwelling and would have an overall depth of 7.9 metres. The proposed front elevation would measure 4.3 metres in width. The highest point of the proposed roof would be 5.1 metres above ground level, with the eaves height on the frontage to be 3.6 metres high above ground level. The eaves height at the rear would measure 4.4 metres above ground level. Two dormer windows are proposed on the south roof slope, to serve 'Bedroom 1'.

ii) Single storey extension - The single storey extension to the rear of the two storey extension would project approximately 8 metres in depth. Its overall width is 6.7 metres, though this would narrow to 3.3 metres at its furthest rear point. A mono-pitched roof is proposed over the utility, hallway and kitchen, with a maximum height of approximately 4.1 metres above ground level and

2.4 metres to eaves height. A dual-pitched roof is proposed over the porch, with a ridge height of 3.3 metres and eaves height of 2.4 metres. Finally, the flat roof / first floor balcony over the remainder of the kitchen/patio area would measure approximately 2.2 metres above ground level.

iii) Car port - At the front of site, a double car port building with store is proposed. The car port would have an overall width of approximately 7.8 metres and a depth of 5.9 metres. The adjoining store would have a footprint measuring 3.3 metres by 3 metres. A pitched roof is proposed, with the ridge height measuring approximately 3.9 metres above ground level and the eaves height 2.7 metres. The proposed pitched roof of the store would be lower with a ridge height of approximately 3 metres above ground level, and eaves height of 2 metres.

iv) Barn extensions - The existing barn to the rear of the site is proposed to be extended to both the north and south.

- To the south, a timber structure (with 'open' sides) would project approximately 4.5 metres in depth and would measure 4 metres in width, to create a covered patio area. The proposed roof would be hipped, with an approximate ridge height of 4.4 metres and eaves height of 2.7 metres.

- To the north, a one and a half storey and single storey extension is proposed. This would have an overall depth of 10.3 metres and an overall width of 4.1 metres. At its shortest point, the width is proposed to be 3.5 metres. The proposed extension would provide a games room, bathroom and tractor store at ground floor. For the one and a half storey games room extension, the ridge height would measure approximately 5.6 metres above ground level, with an eaves height of 3.8 metres. The roof height then drops down to over the single storey tractor shed and bathroom extension, where the proposed ridge would drop down to 4.2 metres with eaves at 2.7 metres.

## Revisions

- The originally submitted drawings of the proposed extensions and garage have been amended following advice from the Conservation Officer, along with corrections made to previous errors on the plans.

- The proposed tree survey has also been revised, following the advice of the Tree Officer, to accurately represent the tree works proposed.

## 2 Planning History

Reference	Proposal	Decision	Date
P0765/86/C	Extension to living room, conservatory, raising the roof and alterations	Permitted	06/10/1986
P179/71	Alterations to form 1 dwelling	Permitted	17/01/1972

## 3 Planning Policy

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

### Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990

#### **Section 72 - General duty as respects conservation areas in exercise of planning functions.**

The Local Planning Authority has a statutory duty to have special regard to the desirability of preserving the Conservation Area or its setting, or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.

### 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.

#### **CS17 - The Historic Environment**

Development should protect, conserve and enhance the historic environment including non-scheduled nationally important features and buildings of local importance.

#### **CS21 - Biodiversity and Geological Conservation**

Development should conserve and enhance biodiversity/ geological interests unless no alternative sites are available and there are demonstrable reasons for the development.

### **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.

#### **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.

#### **PP17 - Heritage Assets**

Development which would affect a heritage asset will be required to preserve and enhance the significance of the asset or its setting. Development which would have detrimental impact will be refused unless there are overriding public benefits.

### **Peterborough Local Plan 2016 to 2036 (Submission)**

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 Proposed Submission version of the Local Plan took place in January and February 2018. The Local Plan was submitted to the Secretary of State on 26 March 2018. A Planning Inspector has been appointed and the Local Plan is going through the Examination stage to establish whether it is 'sound', taking all the representations into consideration.

Paragraph 48 of the National Planning states that decision makers may give weight to relevant policies in an emerging plan according to:-

- the stage of the Plan (the more advanced the plan, the more weight which can be given)
- the extent to which there are unresolved objections to the policies
- the degree of consistency between emerging policies and the framework.

The policies can be used alongside adopted policies in the decision making process, especially where the plan contains new policies. The amount of weight to be given to the emerging plan policies is a matter for the decision maker. At this final stage the weight to be given to the emerging plan is more substantial than at the earlier stages although the 'starting point' for decision making remains the adopted Local Plan.

#### **LP16 - Urban Design and the Public Realm**

Development proposals would contribute positively to the character and distinctiveness of the area. They should make effective and efficient use of land and buildings, be durable and flexible, use appropriate high quality materials, maximise pedestrian permeability and legibility, improve the public realm, address vulnerability to crime, and be accessible to all.

### **LP17 - Amenity Provision**

LP17a) Part A Amenity of Existing Occupiers- 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.

LP17b) Part B Amenity of Future Occupiers- Proposals for new residential development should be designed and located to ensure that they provide for the needs of the future residents.

### **LP29 - Trees and Woodland**

Proposals should be prepared based upon the overriding principle that existing tree and woodland cover is maintained. Opportunities for expanding woodland should be actively considered. Proposals which would result in the loss or deterioration of ancient woodland and or the loss of veteran trees will be refused unless there are exceptional benefits which outweigh the loss. Where a proposal would result in the loss or deterioration of a tree covered by a Tree Preservation Order permission will be refused unless there is no net loss of amenity value or the need for and benefits of the development outweigh the loss. Where appropriate mitigation planting will be required.

## **Supplementary Planning Documents**

### **Design and Development in Selected Villages (2011)**

- Glin 1 – Design
- Glin 2 – Materials
- Glin 3 – Architectural style
- Glin 5 – Rainwater goods
- Glin 6 – Chimneys
- Glin 7 - Design

## **4 Consultations/Representations**

### **PCC Conservation Officer**

No Objection - The proposed carport is styled as a cart shed and is of a subservient, ancillary character. Although it will be a prominent structure within the conservation area, the agricultural character of the building will be in keeping with the village character. There is a slight concern regarding the scale of the building, particularly its height. It is noted however that efforts have been made in its design to keep the height down and in conjunction with the positive design, acceptable colour and subservient materials there is no significant objection to this part of the proposal.

The amendments to the extension have reduced the ridge height and replaced the single larger dormer with two dormers. The reduction in the height of the proposed ridge to distinctly below the existing ridge height in conjunction with the two more proportioned and in keeping dormers create a more subservient appearance for the extension. Although there is a slight concern regarding the covered walkway of the proposals, it is accepted that this contributes to the subservient appearance through the contribution of more subservient materials, with the pantiles roof, and the reduction in clear views of the elevation.

As stated previously there is concern regarding the overall impact upon the non-designated heritage asset however it is accepted that the proposals do not overly detract from the buildings significance and with these amendments do not materially detract from the setting of the conservation area. There is now no objection to the proposals.

It is requested that conditions be imposed regarding

- Materials
- Loss of PD rights for the proposed carport

### **PCC Tree Officer**

No Objection - Further to previous comments and revisions to the Tree Survey plan:

- It has been definitely stated that no trees will be removed to facilitate the proposal.
- Pruning to third party owned trees has been established. This pruning is anticipated to be light and in line with the common law rights of the applicant.
- There are no high value amenity trees onsite.
- As no tree protection has been identified this must be secured by condition if the application is successful.

It is noted that the tree survey plan still remains basic although it indicates the relevant information.

There is no objection to the proposal. To prevent unintentional damage to retained trees onsite and those immediately offsite, it is recommended that a condition is included for the submission and approval of a site specific Method Statement and/or Tree Protection Plan to BS5837:2012 Trees in relation to design demolition and construction - Recommendations methodology.

### **Glinton Parish Council**

Objection - Glinton Parish Council consider the revised plans do little or nothing to address the concerns raised in the earlier email. It was also noted that the conservation officer originally stated:

"The proposed development will harm the significance of the Conservation Area and non-designated heritage asset through inappropriate development....."

In the opinion of the Parish council the revised proposals were insufficient to change that opinion. Glinton Parish council unanimously resolved to oppose the application and urge planning officers to refuse the application on the following grounds:

- The extension to Mouse cottage is too large in scale and destroys what was farm labourers cottages in the conservation area.
- The scale of the resultant building is not in keeping with existing building, or the neighbouring properties also in the conservation area.
- The proposed garage at the front of the building will dramatically alter the current street scene.
- Given the extent of the proposals for the house, there appears little justification for the extent of the works proposed for the barn (it was commented that any approval for the works to the barn should be with conditions that the barn was not to be used for residential or commercial purposes)
- The proposed materials and works are not compliant with the specific planning policies applicable to Glinton Conservation Area, in particular GLIN 1, GLIN 2, GLIN3, GLIN7 and GLIN10.

Parish council were made aware of the objections of the neighbour and are supportive of the neighbour in their legitimate planning objections.

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

Initial consultations: 7

Total number of responses: 2

Total number of objections: 2

Total number in support: 0

2 letters of objection were received from one local resident, they object to the application on the following grounds:

## First round of consultation

- Existing tree survey - This plan fails to show the mature sycamore and conifer that is adjacent to the proposed north extension of the existing barn. The digging of foundations will most possibly compromise the root system of both. What protection is proposed to avoid this from happening?
- Proposed elevations - The proposed extensions and their size will alter the character of the existing building and the materials to be used are contrary to Village Design Guidelines Policies Glin 1/2/3/7/10.
- Proposed elevations (detached barn) - The proposed extensions should be constructed from materials as per Glin 2/3/10 and a heating element with a stackpipe chimney has been installed but it is not shown on the plans. If the development of the barn is to be permitted it should be conditioned that it is not to be used as residential annex.
- Proposed detached garage - The proposed materials are not common and are inappropriate to the village environment. In addition, as it is proposed to be in front of the existing property, it will be highly visible from North Fen Road. It is contrary to Policies Glin 1/2/3/7/10.

## Second round of consultation

- The alterations do not deal with any of the points with regards to design, materials and requirements of the Conservation Area as per the original comments submitted. The neighbour reaffirms their opposition to the proposal.

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

The main considerations are:

- Design and impact to the character and appearance of the site and the surrounding Glington Conservation Area
- Neighbour amenity
- Impact to trees

### **a) Design and impact to the character and appearance of the site and the surrounding Glington Conservation Area**

Section 72(1) of the Town and Country Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (as amended) requires special regard be placed to the desirability of preserving Conservation Areas such as the Glington Conservation Area.

The dwelling is not listed but it is considered to be a non-designated heritage asset within the Glington Conservation Area given its history and design. Under the paragraph 197 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2018), the Local Planning Authority has a duty to have due regard to the scale of any harm or loss along with the significance of the non-designated heritage asset when considering proposals.

### **i) Extensions to dwellinghouse**

The originally proposed extension was not considered by Officers to be sufficiently subservient to the main dwellinghouse, in terms of its design, height and scale. This was particularly in respect of the large single dormer window proposed, and the proposed ridge height which was proposed to be at the same height as the existing ridge of the main dwellinghouse.

Therefore, amended plans were received which reduced the ridge height to below that of the main house and which proposed two smaller dormers on the south elevation. The revised extension is considered to be more in keeping with the scale of the existing property. The proposed extension would have a width smaller than the width of the existing property (approximately 4.3 metres

proposed compared to the 5.5 metre width existing). In addition, the reduced ridge height is considered to further increase the subservience of the extension with the dwelling. With the proposed extension to be set approximately 13 metres back from the existing south-facing elevation of the property, it is considered that the proposal would respect the scale and proportions of the existing house. The proposed extensions would be set 36 metres away from the public highway, behind the line of No. 3 North Fen Road adjacent, therefore it is not considered that proposal would have an unacceptable impact upon the visual character and appearance of the surrounding Glington Conservation Area. The Conservation Officer has additionally advised that the proposed single storey extension to the north of the building would sit comfortably in relation to the heritage asset and therefore would not materially undermine the non-designated heritage asset.

With regards to the two proposed dormers, the Conservation Officer advises that dormers are common features of neighbouring dwellings and those within the wider area. The proposed dormers are considered to be of an acceptable size and scale in proportion with proposed extension and they would not detract from the character and appearance of this non-designated heritage asset.

Glington Parish Council do not agree with the Officer's views above and consider that the proposed extensions would be "too large in scale and would not be in keeping with the character of the of the former farm labourers cottages they would adjoin. They also consider the scale of the extensions would not be in keeping with the surrounding Conservation Area.

## **ii) Detached car port**

The car port originally proposed was not considered by Officers to be acceptable, given that slate was originally proposed to its roof. This was not considered to be in-keeping with the dwelling's pantile roof. The plans were therefore amended to include a pantile roof to the car port.

Officers consider that the revised car port would have the character and appearance of a cart shed and as such would appear as a subservient and ancillary structure to the main residential character of the site. It is considered that its proposed external appearance, to be finished in black boards with red pantiles, would provide an appropriate agricultural character that would accord with the village character.

The proposed car port would be positioned near to the south-west side boundary of the site. This allows the south-facing elevation of the original property to be left visible and unscreened from the development. Whilst the proposed car port has a sizeable footprint, along with a 3.9 metre ridge, it is not considered that the scale of the proposed garage would be at odds with its setting, given the size of the plot and its side position in relation to the main dwellinghouse, which sits higher at 5.4 metres to its ridge.

Although there are hedges that surround the front garden of the application site, views of the car port would be possible from the street scene. At its nearest point, the proposed garage would be positioned approximately 22 metres from the public highway. This considerable distance is considered to sufficient to avoid any adverse impact upon the visual character and appearance of the site and the surrounding area.

To ensure the proposed design of the car port remains of an acceptable standard to reflect its agricultural character, the Conservation Officer recommends that the 'permitted development' rights are removed in relation to the installation of rooflights, the addition of any garage doors and 'filling in' of the front open elevations. This condition is considered necessary and reasonable to ensure the retention of the agricultural character of the outbuilding within its Conservation Area setting.

## **iii) Extensions to barn**

Officers consider that the existing barn contributes positively to the character and setting of the

existing dwelling. However, due to its siting at the rear of site, its significance within the Conservation Area is limited as it cannot be appreciated from the public realm to the front of the site.

It is considered that the proposed extensions would respect the scale and proportions of the existing outbuilding as a result of the 'stepped' roof design proposed, which enhances the character of the original asset. As the outbuilding and proposed extensions would not be readily visible to view from the surrounding area, it is not considered that the proposal would result in any harm to the character and appearance of the surrounding Conservation Area street scene.

To ensure that the barn is to be used as planned and for purposes that would be ancillary to the main house and not for example, as a separate independent dwelling, a condition is recommended to limit the uses to those that would be ancillary to Mouse Cottage only.

In light of the above, Officers consider on balance that the application would be in accordance with Section 72 (1) of the Town and Country Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (as amended), Policies CS16 and CS17 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011), Policies PP2 and PP17 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012) and Policies LP16 and LP19 of the emerging Peterborough Local Plan (Submission Stage) (2018).

## **b) Neighbour amenity**

There are four properties that share boundaries with the application site. These dwellings are No. 3 North Fen Road, No. 5 North Fen Road, No. 9A The Green and No. 10 The Green. The impact of the proposal to each dwelling has been assessed as detailed below.

### **i) No. 3 North Fen Road**

The above dwelling is positioned to the east of the application site. There is approximately 15 metres between the existing side elevation of the application property and the above dwelling and 9 metres between the site boundary and the side elevation of No. 3 North Fen Road. No. 3 North Fen Road has a detached garage to its rear, served by an access between the side boundary and the dwelling. The garden to the rear of the neighbour is enclosed by an approximate 1.8 metre high stone boundary wall along with the pitched roof garage. It is considered that the separation between the proposal and the neighbouring dwelling and garden would be sufficient to avoid any adverse overbearing impact on this neighbour.

Furthermore, given the pitched roof garage serving No. 3 North Fen Road, the two metre high boundary wall between the private road and garden serving this neighbour and the roof height to the proposed single storey extension, it is not considered that the proposed 'balcony area' would gain clear views into the neighbouring rear gardens.

During later afternoon periods, there would be some level of shadowing within the boundaries of No. 3 North Fen Road. However, much of this shadowing would occur across the garage and the associated private road, both of which are not considered to be significant to the amenity of this adjacent neighbour.

### **ii) No. 5 North Fen Road**

No. 5 North Fen Road is positioned to the east elevation of the immediate neighbour No. 3 North Fen Road. However, as its rear garden wraps around the boundaries of this neighbouring site, it also shares a boundary with the application site at the rear of the site.

The proposed extensions to the barn would follow a linear arrangement and would be parallel to the shared boundary of this neighbouring site at the north. The proposed extensions would be sited close to the neighbour's barn. However the barn at No. 5 North Fen Road has no habitable residential use. As such, it is not considered that the proposed barn extensions would cause any



unacceptable impact to the barn. Furthermore, it is not considered that the proposed works would be adversely harmful to the rear garden. Firstly, there are two trees on the boundary which would provide a level of screening to the rear area, limiting the proposal's impact across this neighbouring land. Secondly, to the rear of No. 5 Fen Road, there are two distinct garden areas: one directly behind the dwelling, the second is the space around the barn. It is considered that neither of these areas would be adversely affected by the proposed development and sufficient amenity would remain for this neighbour.

No windows are proposed into the east-facing elevation of the two storey rear extension. In addition, the proposed roof pitch to the mono-pitched single storey extension to the rear of the dwelling would screen views into the rear garden of No. 5 North Fen Road.

### **iii) No. 9A The Green**

This detached dwelling is located to the north-west of site. The proposed double garage is to be located 36 metres to the south. Therefore it is not considered that this part of the proposal would result in any unacceptable impact upon this neighbour's amenity given the significant separation distance.

There are no window openings on the east-facing elevation of this neighbouring property. As such, with the brick boundary and vegetation along this boundary, it is not considered that the proposed extensions to the main house and barn would unacceptably impact upon the level of privacy to this neighbour. In addition, with the proposed extension to the barn to be positioned approximately 27 metres away from the dwelling, along with the extensions to the dwelling being approximately 21 metres away, it is not considered that any adverse levels of overshadowing or overbearing impacts would result for this neighbour.

### **iv) No. 10 The Green**

No. 10 The Green is located approximately 17 metres south of the neighbouring property No. 9A The Green. This property sits forward of the front elevation of the application property, close to where the proposed double car port is to be sited. The proposed store that would adjoin the proposed car port would be positioned approximately 4 metres away from the side elevation of No. 10 The Green. An existing beech hedge is situated along the side boundary between the neighbouring property, its front garden and the proposed garage. The 3.9 metre ridge height of the car port outbuilding would be visible from the neighbouring property. However, given the positioning and orientation of the garage and its relationship with No. 10 The Green, it is therefore not considered that the impact from the proposed garage would be unacceptable.

Given that there are no windows proposed to this garage, it is not considered that the occupiers of No. 10 The Green would have their current level of privacy unacceptably reduced. Furthermore, with the proposed garage directly to the east of the neighbouring dwelling, shadowing would affect this neighbouring property during mid-morning periods only. It is therefore considered that given the short time frame of impact, that the proposed car port building would not result in a significant or unacceptable impact.

On the basis of the above, the proposal is considered to be in accordance with Policy CS16 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011), Policy PP3 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012) and Policy LP17 of the emerging Peterborough Local Plan (Submission Stage) (2018).

### **c) Impact on trees**

The application site is located within a Conservation Area, where trees over a certain size are afforded a degree of protection in the interest of visual amenity.

No trees are proposed to be removed either on-site or to neighbouring land. However, the applicant has advised that pruning works are required to the neighbouring Sycamore tree that is

located east of the existing barn at the rear of site. As the trees are located within the Ginton Conservation Area, any works to them have to be identified within the plans. The original plans submitted did not show sufficient clarity in respect to the proposed tree works. Therefore amended plans were received to provide greater clarity on the exact nature of the tree works proposed.

The pruning works proposed would be carried out on the applicant's land. Although the tree affected is on neighbouring land, the applicant has common law rights to prune branches of neighbouring trees that overhang onto their land. Following re-consultation on these amended plans, the Tree Officer considers that the proposed tree works are acceptable on the basis that no trees are to be removed, there are no high value amenity trees, and that the proposed pruning works would be considered to be 'light' and in line with the common law rights of the applicant.

The Tree Officer advises however that before works can begin on-site, further details would need to be submitted to the Local Planning Authority to ensure that any unintentional damage is avoided to both on-site and immediately off-site trees. Such details would either include a method statement and/or tree protection plan which would advise on tree and root protection measures. These details are recommended to be secured via a suitably worded condition.

In light of the above, the proposal is therefore considered to be in accordance with Policy CS21 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011), Policy PP16 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012) and Policy LP29 of the emerging Peterborough Local Plan (Submission Stage) (2018).

## **6 Conclusions**

Subject to the imposition of the attached conditions, the proposal is acceptable having been assessed in the light of all material considerations, including weighing against relevant policies of the development plan and specifically:

- On balance, the proposal would not unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the site (including the non-designated heritage asset) and the surrounding Ginton Conservation Area. The proposal is in accordance with Section 72 (1) of the Town and Country Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (as amended), Policies CS16 and CS17 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011), Policies PP2 and PP17 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012) and Policies LP16 and LP19 of the emerging Peterborough Local Plan (Submission Stage) (2018).
- It is not considered that the amenity of surrounding neighbours would be adversely impacted upon by the proposed development, in accordance with Policy CS16 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011), Policy PP3 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012) and Policy LP17 of the emerging Peterborough Local Plan (Submission Stage) (2018).
- The proposed development would not unacceptably impact upon the trees on-site or immediately off-site, in accordance with Policy CS21 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011), Policy PP16 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012) and Policy LP29 of the emerging Peterborough Local Plan (Submission Stage) (2018).

## **7 Recommendation**

The Case Officer recommends that Planning Permission is **GRANTED** subject to the following conditions:

- C 1 The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

Reason: In accordance with Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).

- C 2 The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:

- Site Plan (Drawing number 417/01)
- Location Plan (Drawing number 417/02)
- Existing Elevations (Drawing number 002)
- Proposed Elevations (Drawing number 417/202 Revision A)
- Existing Ground Floor and First Floor Plans (Drawing number 417/001)
- Proposed Ground Plan (Dwelling) (Drawing number 417/100)
- Proposed First Floor Plan and Roof Plan (Drawing number 417/101-B)
- Existing Plan and Elevations of Barn Outbuilding (Drawing number 417/011)
- Proposed Plans and Elevation of Barn Outbuilding (Drawing number 417/125)
- Proposed Garage (Drawing number 417/105 Revision B)
- Existing Tree Survey (Drawing number 417/003)
- Tree Survey with proposed tree works (Drawing number 417/004 Revision B)

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.

- C 3 No above ground development shall take place until details of external materials for the dwelling extensions, garage and barn extensions, hereby permitted; have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The details submitted for approval shall include the name of the manufacturer, the product type, colour (using BS4800) and reference number. The development shall not be carried out except in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: For the Local Planning Authority to ensure a satisfactory external appearance against the non-designated heritage asset and within the Glinton Conservation Area, in accordance with Policies CS16 and CS17 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011) and Policies PP2 and PP17 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012).

- C 4 The garage; hereby permitted shall not be occupied or used at any time other than for purposes ancillary to the residential use of the dwelling known as No. 1 North Fen Road (Mouse Cottage) and shall not be occupied, leased or rented as a separate dwelling.

Reason: The site is not adequate to support a separate dwelling given its scale and siting and therefore this development is only acceptable as ancillary accommodation in accordance with Policy CS16 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011) and Policy PP4 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012).

- C 5 The barn and its associated extensions; hereby permitted shall not be occupied or used at any time other than for purposes ancillary to the residential use of the dwelling known as No. 1 North Fen Road (Mouse Cottage) and shall not be occupied, leased or rented as a separate dwelling.

Reason: The site is not adequate to support a separate dwelling because of its location, design and scale and therefore this development is only acceptable as ancillary accommodation in accordance with Policy CS16 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011) and Policy PP4 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012).

- C 6 Notwithstanding the provisions of Class C of Part 1 of Schedule 2 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (or any Order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification), no rooflights shall be constructed or fitted into the proposed roof of the detached garage outbuilding.

Reason: In order to preserve the agricultural character of the proposed outbuilding and the setting of the surrounding Glinton Conservation Area, in accordance with Policies CS16 and CS17 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011), Policies PP2 and PP17 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012) and Policies LP16 and LP19 of the emerging Peterborough Local Plan (Submission Stage) (2018).

- C 7 Notwithstanding the provisions of Class E of Part 1 of Schedule 2 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (or any Order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification), the vehicular parking areas shall remain open and shall not be filled in. The car port shall be maintained as such in perpetuity.

Reason: In order to preserve the agricultural character of the proposed outbuilding and the setting of the surrounding Glinton Conservation Area, in accordance with Policies CS16 and CS17 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011), Policies PP2 and PP17 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012) and Policies LP16 and LP19 of the emerging Peterborough Local Plan (Submission Stage) (2018).

- C 8 Prior to works commencing on the application site (including soil stripping, preconstruction delivery of equipment or materials, the creation of site accesses, positioning of site huts) until a site specific Method Statement and/or Tree Protection Plan to BS5837:2012 Trees in relation to design demolition and construction - Recommendations methodology has been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority that identifies (not exclusively) the following:

- Trees to be retained and those to be removed;
- Location and specification of protective tree measures in addition to appropriate ground protection within the Root Protection Areas of all retained trees within the application site;
- Details of all Root Protection Area infringement during the construction and landscaping phases with details on how the impact will be minimised. This includes the location and specification of 'no dig' constructions (where applicable);
- Details of facilitation pruning;
- Location for access, material storage, site office, mixing of cement, welfare facilities etc;
- Specification of landscaping prescriptions (including fencing/walls and changes in soil level) within the Root Protection Area of retained trees;

The scheme shall be implemented strictly in accordance with the agreed details/plans. The tree protection shall be erected according to the specification and locations shown on the agreed Tree Protection Plan. Signs will be placed on the tree protection emphasising that it is not to be moved, nor the area entered into until the end of development without written permission from the Local Planning Authority's Tree Officer.

Reason: In order to protect and safeguard the amenities of the area, in accordance with Policy CS16 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011) and Policy PP16 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012). This is a pre-commencement condition which is required to ensure no unintentional harm from the works affects any on-site or immediately off-site trees.

Copy to Cllrs Hiller and Holdich OBE