

Application Ref: 15/01245/FUL

Proposal: Ground floor extension to medical centre – resubmission

Site: 92 - 94 Burghley Road, Peterborough, PE1 2QE,
Applicant: Dr S K Pramanik

Agent: Mr N P Branston

Site visit: 10/6/2015 (during consideration of previous application)

Case officer: Ms L Lewis
Telephone No. 01733 454412
E-Mail: louise.lewis@peterborough.gov.uk

Recommendation: **REFUSE**

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

The existing surgery is in No 94 Burghley Road, a small house which is part of a Victorian terrace. The plot and house are about 5m wide, there is a small front garden and a shallow front ground floor extension. The building has been extended at ground floor to the rear; the extension takes up the entire width of the plot and extends about 12m behind the rear building line of the terrace.

The current proposal is to extend sideways from this rear extension, into the garden of No 92. This plot is narrower, at 4m wide at the front, widening to 4.7m along the garden. The extension is shown at 3.7m wide, allowing a 1m wide path for occupants of the house to walk past the extended surgery to the retained garden at the end. The occupants would have about 50 sq m of garden, about 17m from their back door.

No 92 is occupied as a dwelling, although appears to be in the same ownership as the surgery. The new extension would begin about 2m from the rearmost wall of No 92.

There is no on-site parking, and on-street parking is restricted.

There is a tree subject to a Preservation Order in a neighbouring garden just at the end of the application site garden, about 15m from where the building is proposed.

2 Planning History

Reference	Proposal	Decision	Date
15/00711/FUL	Ground floor extension to Medical Centre	Refused	17/07/2015
00/01221/FUL	New front wall and railing - revised scheme	Approved	03/01/2001
00/00935/FUL	New front boundary wall	Refused	19/09/2000
99/01374/FUL	Ground floor extension and alterations	Refused	18/01/2000
99/00984/FUL	Single storey rear extension	Refused	15/10/1999
P1490/88/R	Extension to doctors surgery	Approved	23/01/1989
P0090/89/R	Application for removal of condition previously imposed on P0096/86/R limiting hours of use	Approved	15/02/1990

The applications in 1999 were both to extend the existing surgery further down the garden. They were both refused on neighbour amenity grounds, and the larger extension was refused on lack of parking as well.

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)

CS14 - Transport

Promotes a reduction in the need to travel, sustainable transport, the Council's UK Environment Capital aspirations and development which would improve the quality of environments for residents.

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)

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

PCC Tree Officer

No comments received yet in respect of the current application, however in respect of the recently refused application the Tree Officer commented:

There is no objection to the proposal as it is unlikely that the Turkey Oak subject to the Tree Preservation Order is likely to be affected.

However, if the application is successful and to adequately protect the retained trees from unintentional damage I recommend that an informative states:

It is recommended that Heras fencing is situated 1m outside the crown spread of any retained tree/shrub to protect from accidental direct damage and indirect damage through soil compaction.

Building Control Manager

No comments received

PCC Transport & Engineering Services (18.08.15)

This site does not currently benefit from any on-site staff or visitor parking although there are controlled parking bays in the vicinity of the site. The proposed extension to the surgery would require 6 additional parking spaces to be provided in order to accord with the standards set out in

the current Planning Policies DPD. This would equate to 2 staff spaces and 4 visitors spaces. It is not clear as to where the additional staff would park. It is assumed that they would be issued with resident parking permits however there is already oversubscription to parking in this area. Patients would need to use the limited waiting bays in the vicinity of the site however it is not clear as to how many spaces are actually available for use during surgery hours. It is acknowledged that some trips to the surgery might be by walk mode however no evidence has been submitted to show that this is the case. Based on the current information the LHA would therefore have concerns in respect of this proposal. If however the applicants could produce evidence that there would not be a significant impact in terms of parking requirements the LHA would be willing to consider this information.

Local Residents/Interested Parties

Initial consultations: 19
Total number of responses: 0
Total number of objections: 0
Total number in support: 0

The consultation period does not expire until the 5 September. No neighbour comments were received in respect of the recently refused application. Any comments received will be reported in the Update Report.

5 Assessment of the planning issues

Recently refused application

In July, an application for the same development was refused by Officers. Nothing has changed since then, and the applicant has not provided any additional information or justification, or addressed the reasons for refusal.

Principle of development

As a matter of principle the provision of additional primary care facilities is supported, and in cases of evidenced need should be given significant weight. There is however no evidence with this application of the need for this facility, on this site, to expand. The Design and Access Statement sets out that there is a great local demand for GP services and that this centre is under pressure to cope with it. However it is clear that the surgery is on a small site in a dense residential area, and there is no room for further expansion to be satisfactorily accommodated.

There are other GP and primary care services in central Peterborough at:
Park Medical Centre, 164 Park Road – GPs, pharmacy, associated services
A new, large medical centre and pharmacy is under construction at Lincoln Road/Craig Street which will replace a surgery on North Street and another on Lincoln Road
144-146 Mayor's Walk – GP and associated services
Millfield Medical Centre – St Martin's St/Alma Road – GP and other services
Westgate Surgery, which is in Boots Queensgate – GP and associated services
Thistle Moor Medical Centre – at the north end of Lincoln Road – GP and associated services.

In the absence of any evidence of need, and with no evidence of support from the relevant sections of the NHS, this cannot be given any weight.

The proposed extension would have a footprint of 40sq m, and would introduce another two consultation rooms at the surgery, bringing the total to 5. This would be an unacceptable intensification of the use in this location, and would constitute overdevelopment.

Access and Parking

There is no on-site parking, and nowhere to provide any. The site is close to the Lincoln Road/Burghley Road roundabout, which restricts on-street parking, and although there are marked areas along Burghley Road these are permit-only, or time limited, and over-subscribed.

The applicant has stated that the site is close to the Millfield Local Centre, has bus access, that there is on-site storage for cycles, and that on-road car parking is permitted.

The site is 240m from the nearest local centre, and 550m from the Millfield District Centre. There is a bus route passing the site, the No 1; the in-bound stop is about 200m to the east of the site, and the out-bound stop is about 100m east of the site.

The on-site storage for cycles is not immediately apparent, however there are on-street cycle parking spaces just outside.

The additional maximum parking requirement, according to adopted standards, would be 6 spaces. Normally there would be some discussion about whether provision is required in accordance with the maximum standard or whether fewer spaces would be adequate. In this case, there are already significant parking problems in the area, and the increase in GP provision would result in some, even if minimal, increase in parking demand.

The applicant has stated that “..The majority of the existing patients walk to the site from the adjacent Gladstone area...”. No evidence about the likely level of car parking demand, or the proportion or number of people who walk to the site, has been provided, and given that the proposal would not be acceptable in other respects no discussions have taken place.

Officers are of the view that the proposed extension is likely to lead to an increase in demand for car parking, in an area that already suffers from parking congestion.

Impact on neighbours

The neighbour most affected would be No 92. This house is occupied as a dwelling, but appears to be in the same ownership as the surgery. The proposed extension would be put 1-2m from the rear wall of the house, which would create an unacceptable impact on residential amenity. The rear gardens are long but the retention of some amenity space at the far end would not negate the impact of the extension.

Doors are shown leading from the surgery to the area immediately outside the rear of the house, as well as a window on each end of the surgery extension. This could affect the privacy of residents; fences are shown outside the windows but these would further reduce the area immediately to the rear of the house, so that residents would have almost no circulation space here; and would reduce the amount of retained amenity space.

The applicant has described the rear garden as “unused”, however on the site visit the garden did not appear very overgrown or unmanaged. Whether or not it is currently unused is not the point; it is the amenity space for a dwelling, and should be retained as such. The loss of amenity space is not the only impact that the proposal would have on residents of this dwelling.

The extension would be close to the boundary with No 90. The gardens are long and narrow, the extension would be just over 3m to the flat roof. The side of it would be about 1m from the boundary to No 90, and would be to the north-west. There would therefore be some loss of direct afternoon sunlight. Given that the wall would not be directly on the boundary, it is considered that the impact on occupants of No 90 would be just acceptable.

Trees

The Tree Officer has confirmed that the TPO tree could be satisfactorily protected, using conditions. This would not therefore have to form a reason for refusal.

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 case officer recommends that Planning Permission is **REFUSED**.

- R 1 The surgery is located in a central area of the city, within a terrace of Victorian houses. There is no dedicated parking on site and limited on-street parking in the area.

The intensification of the existing surgery use would result in increased parking demand in an area where on-street parking is restricted to permit holders, and is over-subscribed. This would be likely to result in additional congestion and unsafe parking.

The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies PP12 and PP13 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD.

- R 2 The proposed extension would be constructed on the rear garden of No 92 Burghley Road which is occupied as a dwelling. The surgery extension would be less than 2m from the rear wall of the dwelling. Although there is no window in the rearmost wall, this relationship would have a significant detrimental impact on the amenities of occupiers of that dwelling by way of overbearing impact and by separating the house from its amenity space.

The proposal would be an overdevelopment of the site, and would be detrimental to the character of this primarily residential area.

The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy PP3 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD.

This page is intentionally left blank