

Application Ref: 14/01416/HHFUL

Proposal: Proposed two storey side and single storey rear extension

Site: 33 The Orchards, Orton Waterville, Peterborough, PE2 5LA
Applicant: Mr & Mrs Thomasson

Agent: Jennie Wenman
 Weston Design Ltd

Referred by: Cllr Elsey

Reason: The original plans would affect the neighbour

Site visit: 22.08.2014

Case officer: Mrs T J Nicholl
Telephone No. 01733 454442
E-Mail: theresa.nicholl@peterborough.gov.uk

Recommendation: **GRANT** subject to relevant conditions

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

Site and Surroundings

The site comprises a modern detached dwelling with attached double garage set within a cul de sac of similar detached properties. Adjacent and to the south is No. 33 The Orchards, an identical but "handed" detached house to No. 32, the host property. These properties are constructed at a slight angle to one another thus the front of the properties are closer to one another than the rear (the separation tapers from rear to front). To the north but at right angles to the host property are No's 34 and 35 - two detached houses whose rear gardens face the side of No.33. The host property is well separated from the dwellings on the other side of Orchard Close (to the east) and also those to the west where a footpath and cycleway with verge runs between the rear of No. 33 and the properties beyond.

The Proposed Development

The proposed development has been amended from that originally submitted (discussed further below). It now comprises a two storey extension directly over the existing attached double garage on the south/side elevation of the property, adjacent to the side boundary with No. 32. Also proposed is a single storey extension to the side/rear. This extension would fill in an existing "dog-leg" space to the rear of the attached garage and would extend across the full width of the rear of the property. For the most part the proposed single storey extension projects 4.3 metres from the rear of the existing property but where the current "dog-leg" space is situated, the extension will project 6.28 metres from the rear of the existing garage. This is clearly explained by the submitted drawings.

The two storey extension over the top of the existing garage would have a gable to the front elevation to match the existing front gable to the other end of the front elevation. The proposed single storey extension to the rear has a hipped roof to the side facing No. 32 and a gable to the side facing the rear of No's 34 and 35. This is to enable a full internal roof height to be achieved in this part of the extension containing a kitchen/living room area. The remaining part of the single storey extension (with the hipped roof) contains a bedroom/gym with en suite shower room. The proposed first floor extension would comprise a master bedroom.

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.

National Planning Policy Framework (2012)

Section 7 - Good Design

Development should add to the overall quality of the area; establish a strong sense of place; optimise the site potential; create and sustain an appropriate mix of uses; support local facilities and transport networks; respond to local character and history while not discouraging appropriate innovation; create safe and accessible environments which are visually attractive as a result of good architecture and appropriate landscaping. Planning permission should be refused for development of poor design.

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

Orton Waterville Parish Council

No comments received

Local Residents/Interested Parties

Initial consultations: 6

Total number of responses: 3

Total number of objections: 2

Total number in support: 0

The owners of the neighbouring property, No. 32 objected to the original proposals for the following reasons;

Overbearing, overshadowing and visual impact of the proposals

Over development of the plot

Out of keeping with the low density character of the area

Breach of human rights

No further written comments have been received in relation to the amendments but the neighbours have stated verbally that although the amendments to the two storey extension and the hiping of the single storey roof are appreciated, they still feel that the extension projects out too far and will still affect them.

Orton Waterville Parish Council raise no objections.

Cllr Elsey requested the original scheme be taken to Committee if recommended for approval.

5 Assessment of the planning issues

The issues to consider are;

1. The design of the extensions and their impact on the visual appearance and character of the area
2. The impact of the proposals upon the amenity of neighbouring /nearby residents

With regard to the first issue, policy PP2 of the Planning Policies DPD is relevant as it refers to design quality of development and impact upon the area. This proposal is for a single development but comprises two main elements, namely the first floor extension over the existing attached garage and the single storey extension off the rear of the attached garage and extending across the full width existing rear elevation. It is only the first floor extension that will be visible from a public viewpoint - mainly from the front but possibly from the cycle/footpath to the rear. It is considered that the scale and design of the proposals, together with use of matching materials, is in keeping with the design of the host dwelling and will not appear out of character in the street scene. It is therefore considered that in terms of design the proposed development complies with policy PP2 and is acceptable.

With regard to the second issue, the property is surrounded by other residential properties, all of which have been taken into account. However, there are two neighbouring properties potentially affected most by the proposals; 35 The Orchards which lies to the north of No. 33 and 32 The Orchards which lies to the south.

The rear aspect of No. 35 faces the rear/northern side boundary to No. 33. This means that the occupiers of No. 35 will see the side gable end of the proposed single storey extension over the boundary to the rear of their garden. The garden length to No. 35 is approximately 12 metres. The proposed extension lies to the south of No. 35 and so there may be some overshadowing to the bottom of the rear garden. It will be limited due to the single storey nature of the proposal. No objections have been received from this neighbour and it is considered that with regard to the impact on the amenity of the occupiers of No. 35, the proposal is in compliance with policy PP3 of the Planning Policies DPD.

The proposed first floor extension over the existing garage and the side of the single storey extension with a hipped roof lie to the north of the common side boundary with No. 32. Both these properties are identical but handed in terms of design which means each property has an attached garage to the side nearest the common boundary. Thus the parts of the properties containing habitable rooms are well separated from one another. Also these two properties are built at a slight angle to one another, meaning the houses become further apart towards the rear (this is clear on the submitted plans).

The owners of No. 32 raised objections to the original plans as set out above. Following a visit to No.32 it was the case officer's opinion that the proposals would affect the amenity of these neighbours when enjoying their garden by way of the extensions being overbearing. It was not considered that the proposals affected the living conditions from within the property at No. 32. The applicant was requested to amend the plans and has done so in accordance with advice given by the case officer. The amendments are as follows;

Removing approximately 2 metres off the depth of the proposed first floor extension to the rear so that it now only sits above the existing garage.

Removing the gable end to the side of the single storey element which faces the side of No. 32 and replacing it with a hipped roof.

The overall size of the single storey element remains as originally submitted. It extends out by 6.28 from the rear of the existing garage (which is set back from the main rear wall of the dwelling)

and 4.3 metres out from the main wall of the dwelling. This means that the "dog leg" space to the rear of the garage is removed/infilled.

The owners of No. 32 have verbally commented that although they appreciate the changes made to the plans, the rear extension is still too deep.

The amended proposals must comply with policy PP3 of the Planning Policies DPD with regard to amenity in order to be acceptable. There is no impact upon the amenity of the neighbours' living conditions within their house. The only potential impact is upon the enjoyment of the rear garden space. It is considered that the setting back of the first floor extension over the existing garage means that this element of the proposal will have negligible impact as it sits between the properties.

The single storey extension does not run parallel with the boundary fence due to the properties being built at a slight angle to one another. At its furthest point it will be approximately 3.0 metres from the boundary. Given that it is single storey and has a hipped roof sloping away from the boundary with No. 32, it is considered that this part of the extension cannot be said to be overbearing. It will not overshadow the garden to No. 32 as it lies to the north and there are no issues with loss of privacy. Therefore the proposal complies with policy PP3 and is acceptable.

6 Conclusions

The proposal has been considered against the relevant development plan policies namely policies PP2 and PP3 of the Planning Policies DPD. It is considered that these policies are in accordance with the aims of the National Planning Policy Framework and as such there are no other material considerations to take into account. The views of the neighbours have been taken into account. The original proposal has been amended and it is considered that the revised scheme will not have any significant impact upon any neighbouring or nearby resident. The proposal is also acceptable in terms of design. The application is accordingly recommended for approval subject to conditions.

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 development hereby approved shall only be carried out in complete accordance with the details shown on the revised plans, namely WES/1662/14/01A Proposed floor plans and elevations and WES/1662/14/02A Existing and proposed roof plan, proposed section A-A, block plan and site plan.

Reason: To clarify what is hereby approved

C 3 The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extensions 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).

Copies to Councillors J Stokes, G Elsey, S Allen