

**Application Ref:** 15/00306/HHFUL

**Proposal:** Proposed two storey side and rear extensions

**Site:** 1 Franklyn Crescent, Eastfield, Peterborough, PE1 5NE  
**Applicant:** Mr Wahidur Rahman

**Agent:** Mr Wayne Farrar  
A&S Designs

**Referred by:** Councillor N Shabbir

**Reason:** Proposal would not harm the streetscene

**Site visit:** 25.11.2014

**Case officer:** Miss Louise Lovegrove

**Telephone No.** 01733 454439

**E-Mail:** louise.lovegrove@peterborough.gov.uk

**Recommendation:** REFUSE

---



---

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

### Site and Surroundings

The application site comprises a two storey semi-detached residential dwelling located within a predominantly residential area. The property is sited at an angle within the streetscene at the junction of Franklyn Crescent and Oxney Road, a principal route within the area. The surrounding area is characterised by dwellings of a similar design, period and style which are set in pairs of semi-detached properties (with some detached dwellings) separated by noticeable gaps.

The application property previously had a single storey side element which was clad in white UPVC and affords habitable living space. Car parking is provided to the front of the dwelling within the curtilage for approximately 3 vehicles. Vehicular access is granted from Franklyn Crescent via a dropped kerb.

### Proposal

The application seeks planning permission for the construction of two storey extensions to both the side and rear of the original dwelling.

It should be noted that the current proposal is an amendment to an earlier approved scheme for a single storey side and two storey rear extension (reference 13/01923/HHFUL). It also follows a subsequent refusal for a two storey side and rear extension (reference 14/01899/HHFUL).

Planning permission reference 13/01923/HHFUL has already been implemented but not completed and as such, this application is part-retrospective.

## 2 Planning History

Reference	Proposal	Decision	Date
94/P0132	Change of use from residential to B1 office	Refused	20/04/1994
13/01923/HHFUL	Single storey side and rear extension and two storey rear extension	Permitted	06/03/2014
14/01899/HHFUL	Proposed ground and first floor extensions to side and rear elevations	Refused	15/12/2014

### **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.

##### **PP12 - The Transport Implications of Development**

Permission will only be granted if appropriate provision has been made for safe access by all user groups and there would not be any unacceptable impact on the transportation network including highway safety.

##### **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**

#### **Local Residents/Interested Parties**

Initial consultations: 5

Total number of responses: 1

Total number of objections: 1

Total number in support: 0

No neighbour representations have been received.

**Councillor N Shabbir** - When this plan was originally submitted, the reason for rejection was that it would affect the streetscene. I beg to differ.

### **5 Assessment of the planning issues**

The main considerations are:

- Design and impact upon the character and appearance of the surrounding area
- Impact upon neighbour amenity
- Parking provision

#### **a) Background**

The planning history of the site is summarised in Section 2 of this report above and as stated, planning permission reference 13/01923/HHFUL has partially been implemented, thereby

making this current application part-retrospective.

The 2013 permission was granted following amendments to the originally submitted scheme. That original scheme sought for the construction of a two storey side extension of similar design to the current proposal with a further single storey front projecting element. At the time of determining that application, Officers advised that the proposed two storey side extension would result in a cramped form of development, removing an important gap between the application site and neighbouring dwelling (No.3 Franklyn Crescent). The resultant loss of such an important gap would result in incongruous development, leading to unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the locality. Accordingly, the scheme was revised by the Applicant to reduce the side element to a single storey extension only.

Following the 2013 planning application, a revised scheme was submitted under application reference 14/01899/HHFUL. This application sought a revised two storey side extension to the property and was refused for the following reason:

*R1 The proposed two storey side extension, by virtue of its height, width and scale, would result in the loss of the existing gap between the application property and No.3 Franklyn Crescent. The character of the streetscene is formed by detached or semi-detached dwellings with spacious gaps between and as such, the loss would appear incongruous and at odds within the streetscene. Furthermore, the proposed two storey side extension, by virtue of its design and form, would fail to respect the architectural style, character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area. The resultant dwelling would appear unduly dominant and obtrusive within the streetscene. Accordingly, the proposal would result in unacceptable harm to the character, appearance and visual amenity of the surrounding area which is contrary to Policy CS16 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011) and Policy PP2 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012).*

As set out in Section 1 above, the current application seeks a two storey side extension of similar design to that which was originally submitted under application reference 13/01923/HHFUL. This does not include the earlier sought single storey front projecting element and has altered the rear two storey element to include a flat roof design.

**b) Design and impact upon the character and appearance of the surrounding area**

The intrinsic character of the streetscene comprises semi-detached and detached residential dwellings separated by significant gaps, all set back from the public realm by front gardens (albeit many of these have been hard surfaced to create on-site car parking). The neighbouring dwelling (No. 3 Franklyn Crescent) has previously been extended by two storeys to the side nearest to the application site, thereby reducing the original degree of separation.

The proposal is of hipped roof design which is acknowledged to respect and reflect the character and architectural style of the host dwelling. However, this element of the proposal has no set-back from the original dwellinghouse and would therefore have a continuous eaves line. Whilst the ridge is slightly lowered, it is not considered that the proposal would appear a subservient element and thus would appear unduly dominant within the streetscene. Furthermore, it would result in the loss of the important gap between the dwellings which is intrinsic to the character of the streetscene (and formed earlier reasons for refusal/amendment). As such, the proposal would result in a dwelling which appears cramped and overdeveloped.

With regards to the design of the single and two storey rear elements of the proposal, it is not considered that these would appear at odds with the character of the locality. Whilst there are no similar examples of flat roof extensions, this would not be visible from the public realm and is not of such a size or scale that it fails to respect the scale of the host property.

In light of the above, the proposed two storey side element of the proposal would result in

unacceptable harm to the character, appearance and visual amenity of the streetscene and surrounding area. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy CS16 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011) and Policy PP2 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012).

**c) Impact upon neighbour amenity**

The proposed two storey rear and single storey side and rear extensions are not proposed to project beyond the line of the rear elevations of both neighbouring properties. With regards to No.3 Franklyn Crescent, the proposed two storey rear extension would not be visible to occupants from primary habitable rooms. Therefore, it would not result in any unduly obtrusive or overbearing impact. With regards to No.79 Oxney Road, the proposed two storey element would be set away from the shared boundary by approximately 2.7 metres. This ensures that it does not break the 45 degree angle from the first floor windows to the neighbouring dwelling. Accordingly, it is considered that there is sufficient separation to prevent any unacceptably overshadowing or overbearing impact to occupants. With regards to the single storey element, this would project by 3.6 metres which is not considered to be an unacceptable length when taking into account 'permitted development' rights. It is not considered that this would result in any unduly overbearing impact to occupants.

On the basis of the above, it is considered that the proposal would not result in any unacceptable impact to the amenities of neighbouring occupants, in accordance with Policy CS16 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011) and Policy PP3 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012).

**d) Parking provision**

Given the large area of hardstanding to the front of the site, there is adequate space provided within the curtilage of the plot to provide the requisite parking of 2 vehicles. The proposal is therefore in accordance with Policies PP12 and PP13 of the 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 Director of Growth and Regeneration recommends that Planning Permission is **REFUSED** for the following reason:

R 1 The proposed two storey side extension, by virtue of its height, width and scale, would result in the loss of the existing gap between the application property and No.3 Franklyn Crescent. The character of the streetscene is formed by detached or semi-detached dwellings with spacious gaps between and as such, the loss would appear incongruous and at odds within the streetscene. The resultant dwelling would appear unduly dominant and obtrusive within the streetscene and accordingly, the proposal would result in unacceptable harm to the character, appearance and visual amenity of the surrounding area which is contrary to Policy CS16 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011) and Policy PP2 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012).

Copies to Councillors: N Shabbir, J Johnson, A Iqbal