

**Application Ref:** 13/00789/HHFUL

**Proposal:** Construction of two storey side and rear extensions, first floor side extension, single storey rear extension and canopy at front - retrospective

**Site:** 20 Grange Road, West Town, Peterborough, PE3 9DR

**Applicant:** Mr M Farooq

**Agent:** G R Merchant Ltd

**Referred by:** Cllr Nawaz

**Reason:** The extensions do not have an adverse impact on the character of the area or neighbour amenity.

**Site visit:** Various site visits undertaken by Local Authority staff

**Case officer:** Mrs A Walker

**Telephone No.** 01733 454418

**E-Mail:** astrid.walker@peterborough.gov.uk

**Recommendation:** REFUSE

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

### Site Description

The application site comprises a 2 storey semi detached dwelling of brick and tile construction. A low rise brick wall flanks the blocked paved front garden. This area provides off road parking for 2 vehicles. The rear garden is fully enclosed by close boarded timber fencing. The surrounding character is residential in nature comprising a mixture of two storey semi detached and detached dwellings. It is noted that a number of the nearby properties have 2 storey side extensions.

### Proposal

#### Background

Planning permission for a two storey side, two storey rear and single storey rear extension was granted under application number 12/00383/HHFUL. The development has been built out on site. However, the development has not been constructed in accordance with the approved permission and a subsequent application reference 13/00240/HHFUL was submitted in an attempt to regularise the development as built. This application was refused under delegated authority for two reasons;

- The negative impact of the development on the character of the area.
- The adverse impact of the development on neighbour amenity.

The applicant submitted an appeal against the refusal of 13/00240/HHFUL on 20 June 2013. The outcome of which is awaited.

### Current application

This retrospective application remains exactly the same as the earlier refused application reference 13/00240/HHFUL. The applicant has submitted this application in order to obtain planning permission for the extensions as built, thereby regularising the development.

Retrospective permission is sought for the erection of a two storey and single storey rear extension. The two storey rear extension projects 4.7 metres from the rear of the dwelling house, with a width of 8.1 metres and a dual pitch roof 5.2 metres above ground level at the eaves and 8.1 metres at the apex. The single storey rear extension measures 5.5 metres deep by 4.7 metres wide with a dual pitch roof measuring 2.3 metres above ground level at the eaves and 4.2 metres

at the apex.

The differences from the approved application reference 12/00383/HHFUL are:

- 1) The two storey rear extension has been built approximately 700 mm longer than shown on the approved plan.
- 2) The total ground floor projection as built is approximately 10.1m long, approximately 1.1 m longer than shown on the approved plan.
- 3) The roof on the side extension has been built higher so that it is flush with the existing ridge line, rather than being subservient to the existing roof, as shown on the approved plans.
- 4) The introduction of a front canopy that extends across the full width of the property; above the bay window, front door and French doors.
- 5) The use of different fenestration including the introduction of French doors to the front of the side extension rather than the garage doors shown on the approved plans.

## **2 Planning History**

<b>Reference</b>	<b>Proposal</b>	<b>Decision</b>	<b>Date</b>
10/00881/FUL	Construction of a two storey and single storey rear extension and first floor side extension	Application Refused	02/09/2010
12/00383/HHFUL	Construction of two storey side and rear extension and single storey rear extension	Application Permitted	04/05/2012
13/00240/HHFUL	Construction of two storey side and rear extensions and single storey rear extension	Application Refused	12/04/2013

## **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**

No statutory consultations required.

## Local Residents/Interested Parties

Initial consultations: 4

Total number of responses: 0

Total number of objections: 0

Total number in support: 0

## 5 Assessment of the planning issues

The main considerations are:

- The impact of the development on the character of the area
- The impact of the development on neighbour amenity

### **The impact of the development on the character of the area**

The application dwelling sits within a mature residential street scene, comprising properties of a similar appearance and with broadly the same architectural detailing. Whilst a number of the properties have been extended and altered it is considered that the extensions to the application dwelling are unsympathetic and out of keeping with the character of the host dwelling and the street scene.

When viewed from the frontage the failure of the applicant to build the side extension with a lowered ridge height has resulted in a pronounced terracing effect giving the impression that the semi detached pair and its detached neighbour are a terrace of three. The lack of a subservient extension has resulted in the dwelling appearing overly wide, bulky and unbalanced.

The construction of a canopy across the entire frontage of the property is considered to be incongruous and the architectural symmetry of the application site and its attached neighbour has been lost, to the detriment of the character of the area.

The inclusion of double French doors in the front elevation of the extension has resulted in a dwelling with no clearly defined main entrance; this is considered to be an incongruous feature, at odds with the symmetry of the pair of semis and the character of the area. The approved scheme included an integral garage and garage doors which would appear more in keeping with the character of the area.

The extension has removed the parking that existed to the side of the dwelling however, it is considered that if the front boundary wall was removed sufficient space for 2 cars to park on site could be provided, which would meet the adopted Peterborough Local Planning Policies DPD parking standards. In addition on street parking is also available hence it would be difficult to refuse the application on parking grounds. It is also noted that whilst an integral garage was provided on the approved scheme it was of a substandard size. It is not therefore considered that what has been built has actually altered the available parking provision from that which was available as part of the previously approved application.

In conclusion the extensions as built are contrary to Policy CS16 of the Adopted Peterborough Core Strategy (DPD) 2011 and Policy PP2 of the Adopted Peterborough Planning Policies (DPD) 2012 as they result in a detrimental impact on the character of the area.

### **The impact of the development on neighbour amenity**

The 4.7 metre projection of the two storey rear extension is considered be unacceptably overbearing to the occupants of the attached neighbour, number 18 Grange Road. In particular the extension results in a poor outlook and overbearing impact on the adjoining property's first floor window, closest to the extension.

The level of development approved at the shared boundary of 4.0 metres under application 12/00383/HHFUL was considered to be the absolute maximum permissible projection. This was

allowed due to the unique circumstances of the site; namely the orientation of the dwellings and the level of ground floor development at 18 Grange Road. The additional 70cm is considered to result in unacceptable harm to the neighbour through overbearing.

The total ground floor projection as constructed is 10.1 metres. 1.1 metres in excess of the development approved under 12/00383/HHFUL it is considered that this 1.1 metres of additional projection result in unacceptable overshadowing of the northern neighbours amenity space (number 22 Grange Road) and is overbearing to the occupiers of this property.

The development is therefore contrary to Policy CS16 of the Adopted Peterborough Core Strategy (DPD) 2011 and Policy PP3 of the Adopted Peterborough Planning Policies (DPD) 2012.

## **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 Head of Planning, Transport and Engineering Services recommends that planning permission is **REFUSED** for the following reasons:

R 1 The two storey rear extension by reason of its depth and massing results in an unacceptable overbearing impact upon the neighbouring dwellings, numbers 18 and 22 Grange Road. In particular it results in unacceptable harm to the outlook of number 18, and creates a sense of enclosure. Furthermore, the proposal results in unacceptable overshadowing of the amenity space and primary habitable room windows of number 22 Grange Road. This is contrary to Policy CS16 of the Adopted Peterborough Core Strategy (DPD) 2011 and Policy PP3 of the Adopted Peterborough Planning Policies (DPD) 2012 which State;

CS16 - New development should not result in unacceptable impact on the amenities of occupiers of any nearby properties

PP3 - Planning permission will not be granted for development which would result in unacceptable;

- (d) Loss of light or overshadowing of any nearby property
- (e) Overbearing impact on any nearby property

R 2 The first floor side extension is not subservient to the existing dwelling, and given its relationship to the existing dwelling number 22 Grange Road creates a terracing effect within the streetscene which would be harmful to the character of the area. The full width canopy and front facing french doors are considered to be incongruous features and have resulted in a cluttered confusing frontage with no main entrance to the dwelling, 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 to the particular character of the site and its surroundings, enhance local distinctiveness and make use of appropriate materials and architectural features.

PP2 - Development will only be granted for development where the layout, design and appearance of the proposal;

(a) would make a positive contribution to the quality of the natural and built environment (In terms of its location, size, scale, massing, density, proportions, materials and design); and

(b) would not have a detrimental effect on the character of any immediately adjoining properties or the surrounding area.

Copies to Councillors: E Murphy, G Nawaz

This page is intentionally left blank