

**Application Ref:** 15/00768/HHFUL & 15/00769/HHFUL

**Proposal:** Proposed two storey side extension, ground floor rear extension and veranda and loft conversion including a dormer window, increasing in roof height

**Site:** 21 Grange Road, West Town, Peterborough, PE3 9DR

**Applicant:** Mr Y Qureshi

**Agent:** Mr N P Branston

**Site visit:** 01.07.2015

**Case officer:** Mr D Jolley

**Telephone No.** 01733 453414

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

**Recommendation:** **15/00768/HHFUL – REFUSE**  
**15/00769/HHFUL – APPROVE**

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

### **Site and surroundings**

The application site is a detached 1920's dwelling of brick and tile construction located within the West Town district. The area is characterised by linear street patterns, with variation in the design of dwellings. The application site is part way through alterations approved under application number 14/00781/HHFUL but has not been constructed in accordance with the approved plans. The planning permission was given for a two storey side extension and single storey rear extensions. The main departure is that the roof has been raised by approximately 45cm, this relates to both the main house roof and the roof of the extension.

### **Proposal**

These applications are an amendment to approved application number 14/00781/HHFUL. Both applications seek approval for the following alterations:

- The height of the first floor windows is increased by 30cm to avoid a large gap from window top to soffit
- Front door is relocated to the front elevation of the side extension, the existing front door replaced by a window
- High level window added to side elevation at ground floor
- 4x skylights and 1x velux added to the single storey rear extension
- Width of rear roof dormer increased, this element now requires permission due to the increased roof height

The difference between the two applications relates to the roof heights;

**15/00768/HHFUL:** Proposes a 9.15 metre ridge height for the main house and a 8.85m ridge height for the side extension (As constructed on site)

**15/00769/HHFUL:** Proposes a ridge height of 8.85 metres for both the main house and the side extension.

N.B. The original roof height is 8.4 metres, under approved application 14/00781/HHFUL the height of the two storey side extension was approved at 8.1 metres above ground level.

## **2 Planning History**

<b>Reference</b>	<b>Proposal</b>	<b>Decision</b>	<b>Date</b>
14/00781/HHFUL	Construction of a two storey side extension, ground floor rear extension and veranda and loft conversion including a dormer window. - Revised application	Permitted	26/06/2014

## **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.

## **4 Consultations/Representations**

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

Initial consultations: 9  
Total number of responses: 2  
Total number of objections: 2  
Total number in support: 0

Two objections have been received in relation to the proposals raising the following points;

I now have a 10ft tall 26ft long concrete wall as my boundary, I feel that the amount of sunlight and aesthetics that have been lost through these developments will only be added to if any further height is allowed to the development of the roof.

I am now in a position to object to the plans as when the initial plans were passed I was in hospital and was unable to accept or respond to correspondence, and so was unaware of the extent of the development.

The rear elevation includes large dormer windows to be constructed in the roof space which will create the potential for overlooking particularly for my property and will inevitably lead to a loss of privacy.

The scale of the proposed alterations alter the proportions of the dwelling resulting in a form, bulk and scale that is out of character with all the adjacent houses on Grange Road. The proposal will inevitably be an intrusion and have an adverse impact on visual amenity.

The extension of the two storey element across the width of the site will result in 'terracing' contributing to the change in character of the street scene.

The extension to the rear is significant when the canopy veranda is included; I am concerned this may create potential noise problems, bearing in mind the proximity to the rear boundary.

The garden building (14/00717/HHFUL) is in breach of condition 2 (materials condition) and the applicant should be monitored to make sure they are constructing in accordance with approved plans. The builders have shown no regard for the damage they have caused to neighbours properties, trespass and encroachment.

Gutters are overhanging neighbours without consent being given.

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

The main consideration are;

- The impact of the proposal on the character of the area
- The impact of the proposal on the amenity of the occupiers of neighbouring dwellings

Committee should note the footprint of the extensions and the height and depth of the canopy veranda have been approved under previous application number 14/00781/HHFUL. Matters relating to these elements will not be discussed at length in this report. As stated above the two application being considered only differ in relation to roof heights;

**15/00768/HHFUL:** Proposes a 9.15 metre ridge height for the main house and a 8.85m ridge height for the side extension.

**15/00769/HHFUL:** Proposes a ridge height of 8.85 metres for both the main house and the side extension.

### **The impact of the proposal on the character of the area**

The moving of the front door to the extension and its replacement with a window could be undertaken without the benefit of planning permission. Notwithstanding this the alteration, whilst slightly unusual for the Grange Road, results in a pleasant composition. The Local Planning Authority are of the opinion that this element of the scheme is better than the porch approved under application 14/00781/HHFUL.

The height of the 1st floor front facing windows has been increased by 30cm in order avoid a large gap between the top of the windows and the roof soffits (created by the raising of the roof). Grange Road is somewhat varied in its character and it would appear that the windows at number 17 are of the approximate size as proposed here. These windows do not look unacceptable and are not immediately apparent in wider views. It is therefore considered that increasing the height of the windows is the correct solution and will not unacceptably harm the character of the area.

As the only material difference between the two applications is the height of the roof, the impact of each proposal in this regard shall be discussed separately below;

### **15/00768/HHFUL**

The increased roof height (9.15 metre ridge height for the main house and a 8.85m ridge height for the side extension) significantly increases the perceived bulk of the dwelling. When viewed from all directions the increased height of the roof is immediately apparent and as such the dwelling has become an incongruous focal point within the street scene. Whilst the increasing window height would help improve the look of the dwelling in isolation, the roof height will ensure that the dwelling

can never integrate acceptably within the street scene and as such causes unacceptable harm to the character of the area.

### **15/00769/HHFUL**

This proposal (ridge height of 8.85 metres for both the main house and the side extension) seeks to reduce the height of the main house roof (as built) by approximately 25cm so that it ties in with the as built side extension roof to create a one height roof as can be seen opposite at 20 Grange Road.

The LPA acknowledge that the dwelling will have a higher roof than its neighbours and that this will be visible from the public realm, but the difference will not be so much as to create an obvious and unacceptable incongruous feature within the street scene. The height difference is more pronounced when viewed from the south as 19 Grange Road is set back by approximately a metre compared to the frontage of the application site.

All other alterations are not visible from the public realm and will have no impact upon the areas character.

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

As stated above the footprint of the extensions and the height and depth of the canopy veranda have been approved under previous application number 14/00781/HHFUL. Therefore it would be unreasonable to refuse the application on the basis of any harm caused to neighbour amenity from these elements given that they are constructed in accordance with approved plans.

The 4x roof lights and 1x velux will have no impact upon the amenity of the occupiers of neighbouring dwellings.

The high level windows added to the side elevations could be added under permitted development once the development had been completed. Notwithstanding this the high level windows are approximately 1.6 metres above ground level and as such are unlikely to result in an unacceptable loss of privacy for the occupiers of 19 Grange Road.

The applicant proposes to increase the width of the approved rear dormer window, by 3.0 metres so that it extends over the side extension. Application 14/00871/HHFUL permitted a dormer of 3.7 metres width, contained within the original house roof, this dormer could have been constructed under permitted development allowances. Notwithstanding this there is no reason to believe that increasing the width of a dormer window by 3.0 metres would result in unacceptable harm to the amenity of the occupiers of nearby dwellings.

The increase in the height of the house roof will result in some loss of light to the neighbour's rear amenity space. However the reduction in light is not severe enough to warrant the refusal of either 15/00768/HHFUL or 15/00769/HHFUL.

### **Other matters**

As stated above the footprint of the extensions and the height and depth of the canopy veranda have been approved under previous application number 14/00781/HHFUL and as such it would be unreasonable to refuse the application on the basis of elements that have previously been found sound.

Most of the objections raised have been discussed above. Objectors have also stated that the applicant has encroached on neighbouring land. This is not a material consideration in determining the application and is a civil matter.

Finally the objectors state that the conduct of the builders has been unacceptable. This is not a material consideration in the determination of the application and could not form the basis of a refusal of the application.

## **6 Conclusions**

The recommendations for the applications, 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, are as follows:

That the Planning Permission for application number **15/00768/HHFUL is REFUSED**, because the design of the roof is unacceptably damaging to the street scene.

That the Planning Permission for application number **15/00769/HHFUL is APPROVED** subject to relevant conditions.

## **7 Recommendation**

The Director of Growth and Planning recommends that Planning Permission for application number **15/00768/HHFUL is REFUSED** for the following reason;

- R 1 The proposal by way of its roof height would become and incongruous focal point within the street scene and would be detrimental to the character of the area. This is contrary to policy PP2 of the Peterborough Planning Policies (DPD) 2012 and policy CS16 of the Peterborough Core Strategy (DPD) 2011.

The Director of Growth and Planning recommends that Planning Permission for application number **15/00769/HHFUL is APPROVED** subject to the following conditions;

- C1 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).

- C2 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).

This page is intentionally left blank