

Application Ref: 15/00392/HHFUL

Proposal: Front single storey extension and erection of a front boundary wall (retrospective)

Site: 29 Parliament Street, Millfield, Peterborough, PE1 2LS
Applicant: Mr Isthkar Majid

Agent: N/A

Referred by: **Cllr Nadeem**
Reason: Officer recommendation conflicts with previous decision on the application
Site visit: 10.04.2015

Case officer: Mr M A Thomson
Telephone No. 01733 453478
E-Mail: matt.thomson@peterborough.gov.uk

Recommendation: **GRANT** unconditionally.

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

Site Description

The application site comprises a mid-terrace two storey property. The form and context of Parliament Street is predominantly residential terraces, however there are examples of detached and semi-detached properties, where the majority have been constructed utilising a yellow brick. There are a number of properties with similar front extensions to the one that has been constructed at No. 29. Properties along the south side of Parliament Street have rear vehicular and pedestrian access.

Proposal

The Applicant seeks retrospective consent for the erection of a single storey front extension to create an enlarged lounge area. The front extension has been completed. It has a floor area of 3.9m x 1.1m and stands at 2.4m to eaves and 3.2m to ridge.

A boundary wall has also been constructed, which stands at 1m in height with 1.4m high pillars.

Reason for Planning Committee.

Planning permission for a part retrospective front extension and wall was refused last year under 14/01395/HHFUL for the following reason;

- R1 The poor match of materials and the difference in height of the eaves to the similar front extension at the neighbouring property (31 Parliament Street) leads the Local Planning Authority to deem that the retrospective application for the front extension to be significantly detrimental to the character and appearance of the area, contrary to Policy CS16 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD 2011 and PP02 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD 2012.

This refusal of planning permission has been reviewed and it is now considered that the development is not considered so harmful to the character or appearance of the area as to make it unacceptable. As this recommendation is contrary to the previous recommendation this application has been reported to Planning Committee for final determination.

2 Planning History

Reference	Proposal	Decision	Date
14/01395/HHFUL	Front single storey extension - retrospective	Refused	30/09/2014

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)

PP01 - Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development

Applications which accord with policies in the Local Plan and other Development Plan Documents will be approved unless material considerations indicate otherwise. Where there are no relevant policies, the Council will grant permission unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

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

Millfield & New England Residents Planning Sub Group

No comments received

Councillor Nadeem

No comments received

Local Residents/Interested Parties

Initial consultations: 5
Total number of responses: 0
Total number of objections: 0
Total number in support: 0

No letters of representation have been received.

5 Assessment of the planning issues

Design, Layout and Neighbour Amenity

Policy CS16 and PP2 seek to protect the character and appearance of the area. Policy PP3 seeks to ensure that any development would not result in an unacceptable overbearing impact, loss of privacy, light or amenity.

The dwelling has been constructed using a yellow brick and brown concrete ridged tile. This brick type is the common material found within the street scene. A number of properties on Parliament Street have built porches to front, the majority of which differ from each other in terms of design and appearance.

The front extension and wall has been built in a red brick and with a higher pitched roof when compared to other porches within the street scene. Whilst the materials are slightly at odds with the yellow brick found on the host building the materials and roof pitch are not considered to be so visually prominent as to render it unacceptably harmful to the host building or the character or appearance of the area.

Whilst no letters of representation have been received the matter of neighbour amenity is required to be assessed. No. 29 (to south) has a similar front extension and wall and the properties are separated by a ginnel; as such the front element and wall would not have a harmful impact on this property. No.31 to north has a triple fronted stone bay window which projects a similar depth to the front extension. Whilst the front extension would reduce light to part of this window, it is not considered to be unduly overbearing or result in a demonstrable loss of light or outlook. As such the relationship is considered acceptable in this instance.

As such the development would not have an adverse impact on the character or appearance of the area or have a harmful impact on the amenity of neighbouring properties. The scheme accords with accords with Policies CS16 of the Peterborough Core Strategy (2011) and PP2 and PP3 of the Peterborough Policies DPD (2012).

Access and Parking

The proposal does not create any additional bedrooms or result in the loss of parking spaces, therefore does not constitute a highway safety hazard and accords with Policies PP12 and PP13 of the Peterborough Policies DPD (2012).

Conditions

As the works have been completed and there are no matters which require further details, planning conditions are not considered necessary in this instance.

6 Conclusions

The proposal is acceptable having been assessed in the light of all material considerations, including weighing against relevant policies of the development plan and specifically:

- The front extension does not harm the character or appearance of the host building or street scene, and accords with Policy CS16 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2012) and Policies PP2 of the Peterborough Policies DPD (2012); and
- The front extension does not harm the amenity of adjoining neighbours, and accords with Policy CS16 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2012) and PP3 of the Peterborough

Policies DPD (2012).

7 Recommendation

The Director of Growth and Regeneration recommends that Planning Permission is **GRANTED** unconditionally.

Copy to Councillors Nadeem M, MBE N Khan and Jamil M