

Application Ref: 14/01025/HHFUL

Proposal: Two storey side and single storey rear and side extension

Site: 38 Audley Gate, Netherton, Peterborough, PE3 9PG
Applicant: Mr B Ali

Agent: Mr Sajid Ayub

Referred by: **Cllr Arculus**
Reason: Loss of amenity to neighbours, impact on architectural landscape
Site visit: 11/6/14

Case officer: Ms L Lewis
Telephone No. 01733 454412
E-Mail: louise.lewis@peterborough.gov.uk

Recommendation: **GRANT** subject to relevant conditions

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

Audley Gate is characterised by detached houses set back from the street. The houses are typical of their period (1960s) with shallow pitched roofs and good-sized windows. Although the houses are all of the same general style, there are design variations.

As the street runs north-south, all of the houses have plots east-west. No 38's plot is about 14m wide, with the west end to the street, and 64m deep. The house is set about 13 m back from the footway.

No 38 has a gable end to the street. It is staggered with the houses to each side; No 36 is set further back on its plot, No 40 slightly further forward. To the south side of the main house is a single-storey flat roofed element containing the hall, then a garage. This flat-roofed part extends as far as the southern side boundary and has a total width of about 4.8m. The house is set slightly off the northern boundary, allowing for a side-way.

The proposal is for a two-storey side extension, set slightly back from the front of the house, and with a width of about 3.8m. This would be roofed with a roof at right angles to the existing roof, the ridge set down by about 0.7m. The side extension would allow for a larger hall at ground floor, a small bathroom, and would lead through to the extended kitchen. This kitchen would be mostly single storey, and this element would project from the rear of the house by about 5m. It would not extend all the way across the rear of the original house, to allow for a window to the rear dining room.

The upstairs of the two-storey part would accommodate two more bedrooms.

2 Planning History

10/01646/FUL	Proposed outbuilding - part retrospective	PER	30.11.2010	25.01.2011
11/00847/FUL	Construction of Proposed Outbuilding - Part Retrospective	PER	27.05.2011	21.07.2011

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.

4 Consultations/Representations

Given the nature of the proposal there have been no formal consultations with any statutory consultees.

Local Residents/Interested Parties

Initial consultations: 8

Total number of responses: 4

Total number of objections: 4

Total number in support: 0

Objections have been received from four neighbouring households on the following grounds:

- Will tend to reduce the openness of the relatively unique streetscape
- Will set undesirable precedent
- Filling in the gaps between dwellings will reduce spacious nature of the street over time
- Similar extension was refused and dismissed at appeal – principles remain valid
- Effect of proposal would be bulky and overbearing when viewed from the front, rear and side of our property (No 36 to the south) – there would be no objection to an enlarged single storey extension or two storey at the rear of the property
- There would be no compensating planning benefits from the point of view of the community
- There will be more cars parked on the road, on the pavement, on the verges, this is already happening because of multiple occupancy in some of the properties in the road
- Road is part of a bus route and should be kept as clear as possible

- Parking congestion can be a hazard to people crossing the road
- Will affect the view from our property (No 37) instead of mature trees we will see bricks and mortar
- People in the second storey of 38 will be able to see into part of our back garden which is not presently overlooked

5 Assessment of the planning issues

The development is acceptable in principle, being a residential extension to a residential property in a spacious residential area. One neighbour has commented that there will not any planning benefit to the community, but this is not a requirement that would relate to this proposal and it could not be resisted on this basis.

The key issues are:

- Design and impact on the streetscene
- Impact on neighbour amenity
- Parking.

Design and Impact on the Streetscene

Audley Gate has various housing designs, including roofs both parallel and perpendicular to the street. These are not grouped in any particular pattern, and some houses have roofs which continue down over single storey elements. This creates variation in the streetscene, and along with the staggered building line emphasises the separation of dwellings.

No 38 has a roof which is perpendicular to the street (that is, the ridge runs front to back), as do the dwellings to each side. The proposed two storey side extension would be roofed at right angles to the main roof, with the ridge set down slightly. This would keep the mass down and would also, by using a different orientation of roof line, use the pattern of variation that already exists in the street to break up the built form and ensure that the new element does not appear overly dominant.

The house at No 44 has been similarly extended, and in that case it is not the shape of the roof that makes it stand out but the stark red of the roof tiles.

Matching materials should be used for the proposed extension. An informative will be appended to the planning consent for No 38 suggesting that the applicant uses tiles taken off the existing roof for the front part of the new roof, as this method is often used to ensure a consistent appearance on the public face of extended buildings.

As there are already differing roof styles in the street it is not considered that the proposal would cause any harm. The ridge would be set down slightly, and although the pitch would be different to that of the main house this is unlikely to be readily noticeable.

Neighbours have commented that the proposal would reduce the openness of the streetscene. The separation between the house and No 36 will reduce from the current 6m to about 2.4m. This is clearly a reduction, but equally clearly there will still be a noticeable separation therefore the overall open character of the street will be maintained. The distance is similar to that between No 44 and No 42.

Neighbours have commented that the proposal could establish an undesirable precedent, and that the spacious nature of the street could be lost over time. Establishing a precedent is not something to be given weight, as each proposal must be judged on its individual merits.

The existing house is tile-hung at first floor to the front. This is a feature of several similar houses in the street. No mention is made of this in the application documentation. It is not considered that the front of the extension needs to be tile-hung, but it is considered that the detail of the corner,

where the brick projects slightly from the main part of the wall, should be replicated on the extension. This is shown on the plans, but in the absence of a condition it could easily be left off when the extension is constructed. A condition is therefore recommended.

Impact on neighbour amenity

The neighbour most closely affected would be at No 36, to the south. There are two first floor side windows on the dwelling, which are both secondary windows to the main bedrooms. The proposed side extension would be opposite the forward of these two windows, but because of the staggered layout of the dwellings it would not be opposite the rearmost of the two windows. The distance between the side windows and the proposed new side wall would be about 2.4m.

Given that the windows to No 36 are north-facing side windows it is not considered that the proposed extension would have a significant detrimental impact on occupants in terms of loss of light.

The occupants of No 36 have also objected on the grounds of overbearing impact. The two-storey part of the extension will not have any significant impact at the rear of their property, as their house is set further back. The new extension would be visible from the front bedroom window, but it would be 2.4m away sideways and would project about 5m at the front beyond the front of No 36. The centre of the existing bedroom window in No 36 is about 1m away from the side of that house.

The proposed new extension would reduce outlook from this window at No 36, but given the set off distances it is not considered that this would be to an unacceptable degree. The proposed new extension would be to the north of No 36 and so there would be no material loss of sunlight.

The ground floor to No 36, on the north side of the plot, is occupied by the garage so there would not be any concern about impact on this part of the house.

The single storey extension would have a pitched roof which would slope up and away from No 36. This will have an eaves height of about 2.6m, set about 1m off the boundary, to the north of No 36. This is not considered to be harmful.

There is already a side landing window to No 38, which offers an outlook towards the two side windows, but it appears to be obscure glazed. In order to avoid overlooking from the new landing window, which would be 3.8m closer, a condition requiring obscure glazing is recommended.

A neighbour across the road has commented on loss of view, and overlooking from the second storey into his garden. The front-to-front distance between the two houses is about 50m so this is not considered to be a material concern.

The proposal is therefore considered to comply with Policy PP3.

Parking

The extension would result in the loss of the garage. The existing front driveway is generous, and would easily accommodate two or three vehicles with space for them to turn. Some objections have been received on the grounds of loss of parking, but there is no requirement for occupants to retain the existing garage for parking, and only a small amount of driveway will be lost. Neither can an application be resisted on the grounds that there will be more parking on a driveway.

The proposal is considered to comply with Policy PP13.

Appeal decision at No 33

Some neighbours have referred to the current application as being the same as one refused/dismissed at No 33 in 2008, but there are material differences. The plans refused at No 33 were for a side extension continuing the existing roof lines, which would have increased the perceived bulk of the extension and created a dwelling of greater unrelieved mass than others in the street. That application would have resulted in only a 1m gap between neighbouring dwellings,

which is not considered to be adequate in this context.

The Inspector also concluded that there would be some overbearing impact on the immediate neighbour, but no unacceptable loss of light or overshadowing.

Overall, it is not considered that the current proposal is sufficiently similar that the appeal decision should influence the decision on the current application. As set out above, the form, mass and separation are all materially different. Also, of course, the earlier proposal was determined under a different policy regime.

6 Conclusions

The proposal will not cause any material harm to the amenities of occupiers of neighbouring properties

There will be no harm to the streetscene

The proposal is therefore in accordance with Policy CS16 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD and Policies PP2 and PP3 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD.

7 Recommendation

The Director of Growth and Regeneration 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 materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Reason: For the Local Planning Authority to ensure a satisfactory external appearance, in accordance with Policy CS16 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011) and Policy PP2 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012).

C 3 Before the development hereby permitted is first occupied, the proposed window(s) to the landing on the south elevation shall be obscure glazed, and non-opening unless the parts of the window which can be opened are more than 1.7 metres above the floor of the room in which the window is installed and shall subsequently be retained as such.

Reason: In order to protect and safeguard the amenities of the adjoining occupiers, in accordance with Policy CS16 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011) and Policy PP3 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012).

C 4 Prior to the commencement of construction details of the brick detailing to the south west corner of the extension shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, showing how the projecting brick corner detailing to the south-west corner of the original house will be replicated on the south-west corner of the extension. Construction shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In order to maintain the architectural character of the area in accordance with Policy CS16 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD.

Copies to Councillors N Arculus and Y Maqbool

This page is intentionally left blank