

Planning and EP Committee

Application Ref: 18/01495/HHFUL

Proposal: Erection of single storey front and side extensions and erection of 1.8m timber fence to the front

Site: 40 Broad Wheel Road, Helpston, Peterborough, PE6 7EE

Applicant: Mr & Mrs Birch

Agent: Mr Scott Whight
Scott Whight Ltd

Referred by: Councillor Over

Reason: Applicant amenity grounds

Site visit: 14.09.2018

Case officer: Miss Sundas Shaban

Telephone No.: 01733 453504

E-Mail: sundas.shaban@peterborough.gov.uk

Recommendation: **REFUSE**

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

The application site comprises a two storey red brick built semi-detached dwelling located within the Helpston Village envelope. The property has a small porch addition to the front and a small single storey element to the rear. A small outbuilding is located at the far end of the rear garden. The property benefits from a wrap around garden with the majority of the land sitting to the side and front of the dwelling. The front garden has parking provision for several vehicles.

The street scene is made up of detached and semi-detached dwelling of similar size and appearance. The majority of the properties in this part of the street are identical in appearance and have been left untouched from the time they were originally built.

Proposal

The application seeks planning permission for single storey front and side extensions . It would project to the side by 5.8 metres and have a front projection of between 1.3 metres and 2.3 metres. The extension would have two gable ends to the front with a small recessed section in the middle. The overall height would be 5.1 metres (2.4 metres to the eaves). A new 1.80 metre high fence is also proposed.

All external materials are proposed to match the existing dwelling.

It should be noted that the proposal has been amended with the first floor element initially proposed now omitted.

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)

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.

PP13 - Parking Standards

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

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.

LP13 - Transport

LP13a) New development should ensure that appropriate provision is made for the transport needs that it will create including reducing the need to travel by car, prioritisation of bus use, improved walking and cycling routes and facilities.

LP13b) The Transport Implications of Development- Permission will only be granted where

appropriate provision has been made for safe access for all user groups and subject to appropriate mitigation.

LP13c) Parking Standards- permission will only be granted if appropriate parking provision for all modes of transport is made in accordance with standards.

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.

4 Consultations/Representations

PCC Tree Officer

No comments received.

The Woodland Trust

No comments received.

Forestry Commission

No comments received.

Peterborough Local Access Forum

No comments received.

PCC Rights of Way Officer

No comments

The Open Spaces Society

No comments received.

Ramblers (Central Office)

No comments received.

Helpston Parish Council

No objections.

Local Residents/Interested Parties

Initial consultations: 7

Total number of responses: 0

Total number of objections: 0

Total number in support: 0

No letters of representation have been received from local residents/interested parties.

5 Assessment of the planning issues

Design and impact on the character of the area

The applicant has advised that the proposed extension is required to accommodate disabled elderly parents who are going to live with them.

The general design principle for extensions is that they should to be subservient to the dwelling which they relate. For side extensions this is normally achieved by setting the extension back from the front elevation of the main dwelling, and by ensuring that is of a proportional width to the existing dwelling, so as not to dominate it.

The initial proposal was not considered acceptable it did not meet the above requirements.. The proposal has since been amended to omit the first floor element. Whilst this alleviates some of Officers concerns, the proposal is still considered to be unacceptable from a design perspective.

It is considered that at 5.8 metres wide the proposed extension would be overly wide in relation to the existing house which is about the same width. This combined with the proposed forward projection incorporating two gables which are not a characteristic of the property design, along with the size/massing of the roof which would have a maximum height of 5.1 metres, would result in a substantial extension which is not subservient to the existing property and one which is considered to be unacceptable in design terms. The proposed extension given its size and massing would dominate the existing property along with the adjoining semi detached property. It would appear as 'bolt on' feature, largely as a result of the front projections and twin gables. As such it would be out of keeping with the design of the neighbouring properties (which are all of a similar appearance) and appear incongruous within the streetscene, notwithstanding the set back from the road. As such the proposal would be visually harmful to the appearance of the dwelling and the surrounding street scene, .

In addition to the unacceptable design, and whilst each application has to be considered on its own merits, there is also a concern that the plot may be subdivided in the future with the proposed extension used as a separate independent unit given it does not have any reliance on the existing house The initial proposal included a second kitchen. The revised proposal does not show a second kitchen, however the space for the kitchen is still maintained therefore a kitchen could easily be installed. Subdividing the plot would result in unacceptable impact on the character of the area would result in a semi-detached dwelling becoming terraced.

The need for the applicant to create space for elderly parents is noted and it is considered that there is scope to extend the property. However the extension does need to be designed to ensure that it sits comfortably with the existing property and the wider streetscene. Officers are happy to work with the applicant to find an acceptable solution. Suggestions have been made to the applicant as to how this would be accommodated in a way which would achieve an acceptable design, however the applicant has asked for the current proposal to be determined.

The application also includes a new section of 1.80 metre high fencing to the front. The fence would be well set back from the road and as such there are no concerns with this aspect of the scheme.

As such the proposal is considered to result in unacceptable impact on the host dwelling as well as the character, appearance or visual amenity of the surrounding area, contrary to Policy CS16 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011), Policy PP2 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012) and Policy LP16 of the emerging Peterborough Local Plan (2018).

Neighbour amenity

The nearest neighbour affected by the proposal is to the south-west (no.42) The proposed extension would be located at least 10 metres from this neighbours boundary given there is a

public footpath separating the two dwellings. This distance is considered sufficient as to not result in overbearing impact or unacceptable overshadowing on this neighbour.

With regards to the attached neighbour to the north-east the majority of the proposed extension would be blocked by the presence of the existing two storey dwelling. Only the front projecting elements would be visible to this neighbour. The nearest part would be located approximately 3.5 metres from the shared boundary with this neighbour. This separation distance is considered acceptable given the elements visible to this neighbour would only stand at 3.4 metres height (2.4 metres to the eaves) with the roof facing away from the neighbour, thereby further reducing the impact.

Given the above the proposal is not considered to result in unacceptable impact upon the amenities of neighbouring occupants, 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 (2018).

Parking

The site benefits from a very large front garden which can accommodate several vehicles. The proposal would result in the creation one more bedroom, however the parking requirement on the site would not increase and sufficient off-street parking would be retained

As such it would not result in any unacceptable impact on the nearby public highway, in accordance with Policy PP13 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012) and Policy LP13 of the emerging Peterborough Local Plan (2018).

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 case officer recommends that Planning Permission is **REFUSED**

- R 1 The proposed side and front extensions would, by reason of their width, front projection including gables and overall size/massing of the roof result in an unacceptable design which would dominate the existing property and appear incongruous, failing to respect the character, visual appearance and proportions of the host property, adjoining semi detached and the surrounding area. The extensions would be clearly visible in the public realm, to the visual detriment of the property and the wider street scene. As such the proposal would be contrary to Policy CS16 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011), Policy PP2 of the Peterborough Planning Policies (2012) and Policy LP16 of the Emerging Peterborough Local Plan (2018).

This page is intentionally left blank