

Application Ref: 14/02039/HHFUL

Proposal: Single storey extension to rear - retrospective

Site: 40 Farleigh Fields, Orton Wistow, Peterborough, PE2 6YB

Applicant: Mr Stuart Cleworth

Agent: n/a

Referred by: **Head of Planning Services**

Reason: A councillor lives next door

Site visit: 15.12.2014

Case officer: Mr D Jolley

Telephone No.: 01733 454408

E-Mail: david.jolley@peterborough.gov.uk

Recommendation: **REFUSE**

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

Site and surroundings

The site is a two storey detached dwelling of brick and tile construction in a residential cul de sac location. The dwelling has an attached double garage to the front of the property, open front garden and fully enclosed rear garden. The property has been extended to the rear with a small single storey extension.

The surrounding area is characterised by relatively large detached dwellings of individual design comprised by a mix of single and two storey accommodation.

Proposal

Retrospective permission is sought to extend the existing single storey extension by 4.0 metres to make an extension of 7.3 metres depth with a dual pitch roof measuring approximately 4.15 metres above ground level.

Under the prior approval process (application number 13/01326/PRIOR) the applicant was given permission to extend the existing single storey extension by 2.9 metres to make an extension of 6.2 metres deep. The roof was altered from a flat to dual pitch measuring 3.8 metres.

2 Planning History

Reference	Proposal	Decision	Date
13/01326/PRIOR	Single storey rear extension Distance from rear wall of original dwelling: 6.2m Maximum height: 3.8m (height to eaves 2.5m)	Prior Approval Permitted	14/10/2013
08/00822/FUL	Single storey rear extension. Demolition of double garage and erection of a first floor front extension and single storey extension linking to a new double garage (amended plans received 08.08.2008)	Permitted	12/08/2008

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

Enforcement Team

No comments received

Orton Waterville Parish Council

No comments received

Local Residents/Interested Parties

Initial consultations: 4

Total number of responses: 0

Total number of objections: 0

Total number in support: 0

No representations have been received in relation to the proposal.

5 Assessment of the planning issues

The main consideration is:

The impact of the proposal on the amenity of the occupiers of neighbouring dwellings

The plans originally submitted by the applicant are considered to be inaccurate and a set of accurate plans were requested. The revised set of plans are slightly more accurate, but depending on the elevation shown the extension scales at a height of 4.0, 3.8 and 3.7 metres respectively. The applicant confirmed by phone that the extension measures 4.1 metres in height. Measurements by the Case Officer were taken at approximately 4.15 metres. It is therefore the case that the file does not contain an accurate set of plans.

Whilst this would not normally be accepted it is considered that as the proposal is retrospective, it is acceptable for committee to assess the proposal as built during the site visit as the extension is complete except for the ridge tile topping the roof.

The applicant has permission by virtue of the prior approval process for an extension projecting an additional 2.9 metres from the rear extension, to make a total of 6.2 metres, and rising to a height of 3.8 metres. The applicant has therefore constructed an extension approximately 1.1 metres deeper and 0.35 metres taller than was approved.

Under the prior approval application the Case Officer acknowledged that a small amount of additional overshadowing to the neighbours amenity space would be caused by the increase in size to the existing extension. This impact has been greatly increased through the additional depth and height of the extension as constructed. The application site is due south of the neighbour and as such is the worst orientation for loss of light.

To the east of the application site there is a thick tree belt with mature trees, which completely encloses the eastern outlook of the application site and the neighbouring property number 39 Farleigh Fields. As such the neighbour to the north has a somewhat enclosed and dark rear garden. The south aspect, between the houses and the tree belt, is relatively open and allows some direct sunlight to reach the amenity space of 39 Farleigh Fields. It is considered that the additional depth and height of the extension leads to a further enclosure of the neighbour's outlook. This in combination with the additional overshadowing caused by the extension is considered to result in an unacceptable impact upon the amenity of the occupiers of the neighbouring dwelling.

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 Director of Growth and Regeneration recommends that Planning Permission is **REFUSED**

R 1 The extension, by way of its height, depth and location and given the orientation of the dwellings, would result in an unacceptable level of overshadowing and enclosure for the neighbour 39 Farleigh Fields, to the detriment of their amenity. This is contrary to policy CS16 of the Peterborough Core Strategy (DPD) and policy PP3 of the Peterborough Planning Policies (DPD) 2012 which state;

CS16 - New development should not result in unacceptable impact upon the amenity of the occupiers of neighbouring dwellings.

PP3 - Planning permission will not be granted for development which would result in; (d) loss of light to and/or overshadowing of any nearby property; or (e) overbearing impact on any nearby neighbour.

Copies to Councillors J Stokes, G Elsey, S Allen

This page is intentionally left blank