

**Application Ref:** 16/00421/HHFUL

**Proposal:** Proposed one and two storey side extension

**Site:** 276 Eastfield Road, Eastfield, Peterborough, PE1 4BE  
**Applicant:** Mr G Singh

**Agent:** Mr N P Branston

**Referred by:** **Councillor Shearman**  
**Reason:** Harm to the setting of the adjacent Listed Building

**Site visit:** 14.04.2016

**Case officer:** Miss Louise Lovegrove  
**Telephone No.** 01733 454439  
**E-Mail:** louise.lovegrove@peterborough.gov.uk

**Recommendation:** **GRANT** subject to relevant conditions

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

### **Site and Surrounding Area**

The application site comprises a two storey semi-detached residential dwelling of the inter-war period located on the western side of Eastfield Road. The existing property is characterised by period architectural features such as a double bay frontage under projecting pitched gable, mock timber framing and render to the first floor above red brick with matching surrounds and quoins. The pair of semi-detached properties remain untouched in terms of their detailing.

The front boundary of the site is formed by a low close boarded timber fence with mature hedgerow above whilst the northern boundary is formed by a mature row of trees which are prominent within the streetscene. These trees act as a break in the streetscene, beyond which is the Grade II Listed Building of No.278 Eastfield Road. The surrounding area is characterised by predominantly large detached residential dwellings set within spacious plots. There is considerable variation to the form and style of the surrounding locality.

### **The Proposal**

The application seeks planning permission for the construction of a two storey and single storey side extension. The extensions would be sited beyond the northern elevation of the original dwellinghouse, adjacent to the shared boundary with No.278 Eastfield Road.

## **2 Planning History**

<b>Reference</b>	<b>Proposal</b>	<b>Decision</b>	<b>Date</b>
15/01127/HHFUL	Single storey side extension	Permitted	29/09/2015

## **3 Planning Policy**

Decisions must be taken in accordance with the development plan policies below, unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

### **Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990**

#### **Section 66 - General duty as respects listed buildings in exercise of planning functions**

The Local Planning Authority has a statutory duty to have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting, or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.

### **National Planning Policy Framework (2012)**

#### **Section 12 - Conservation of Heritage Assets**

Account should be taken of the desirability of sustaining/enhancing heritage assets; the positive contribution that they can make to sustainable communities including economic viability; and the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness. When considering the impact of a new development great weight should be given to the asset's conservation.

Planning permission should be refused for development which would lead to substantial harm to or total loss of significance unless this is necessary to achieve public benefits that outweigh the harm/loss. In such cases all reasonable steps should be taken to ensure the new development will proceed after the harm/ loss has occurred.

### **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.

#### **CS17 - The Historic Environment**

Development should protect, conserve and enhance the historic environment including non-scheduled nationally important features and buildings of local importance.

### **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.

#### **PP17 - Heritage Assets**

Development which would affect a heritage asset will be required to preserve and enhance the

significance of the asset or its setting. Development which would have detrimental impact will be refused unless there are overriding public benefits.

### **Peterborough Local Plan 2016 to 2036 (Preliminary Draft)**

This document sets out the planning policies against which development will be assessed. It will bring together all the current Development Plan Documents into a single document. Consultation on this document runs from 15 January to 25 February 2016.

At this preliminary stage the policies cannot be afforded any weight with the exception of the calculation relating to the five year land supply as this is based upon the updated Housing Needs Assessment and sites which have planning permission or which are subject to a current application. Individual policies are not therefore referred to further in this report.

## **4 Consultations/Representations**

### **PCC Conservation Officer (26.03.16)**

No objections - It is considered that the proposed extension would not have an adverse impact on the setting of the adjacent Grade II building given its form and detail. It is important that the new work picks up on the detail and finish of the existing and this should be subject to a condition.

### **PCC Tree Officer (18.05.16)**

No objections - The proposal will be more affected by the existing trees than the previously permitted two storey extension, requiring facilitating pruning. However, the Sycamore tree affected is not of sufficient quality to be formally protected and pruning would be in line with the Applicant's common law rights. As such, the proposal is unlikely to be detrimental to the amenity of the area.

### **Victoria Park Residents Association**

No comments received.

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

Initial consultations: 9

Total number of responses: 3

Total number of objections: 2

Total number in support: 0

One objection has been received from a local resident on the following grounds:

- The close proximity and height of the extension will cause a loss of sunlight and daylight to the southern boundary of No.278 Eastfield Road.
- The windows in the extension would overlook No.278 Eastfield Road, causing a loss of privacy and a feeling of being enclosed/hemmed in.
- The extension is too close to a line of mature trees and the new foundations will damage the tree roots.
- The extension is too close to a Listed Building and will detrimentally affect its appearance, which is already on a small plot given the size of the building.

In addition, one further representation has been received. This does not raise objections but does ask for the following to be considered:

- Appropriate attention should be paid to the detailed design and finishes of the extension. The proposed frontage is to the same line as the existing building which is going to make matching the materials difficult and would leave the pair of semi-detached houses unbalanced.
- It is therefore suggested that the new frontage is marginally set back.
- Not convinced that the new gable enhances the scheme.
- Sure that the Council's Conservation Officers can make appropriate conditions with respect to architectural design details and facing materials.

**Councillor Shearman** has requested referral to Committee on the grounds that the proposal is not in accordance with policies that affect the setting of a listed building, namely policies CS17 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011), PP17 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012) and paragraph 129 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2012).

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

The main considerations are:

- Design and impact upon the character and appearance of the surrounding area
- Impact upon heritage assets
- Neighbour amenity
- Parking and highway implications
- Trees

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

It is considered that the proposed extensions would both respect and reflect the character, appearance and form of the host dwellinghouse. In terms of the two storey element of the proposal, this would follow the line of the front elevation of the host dwellinghouse and match the design in terms of architectural features - additional gable to the eaves line, fenestration arrangement and brick detailing. It is acknowledged that generally, extensions of this type should be marginally set back from the principal elevation to give an appearance of subservience and this is a comment raised by both local residents and the City Council's Conservation Officer. However, in this instance it is not considered necessary. Subject to securing appropriate materials and detailing (which could be dealt with by way of a condition), the proposal would appear a natural extension. Whilst the immediately adjacent property has not benefited from any extensions, it is not considered that the proposal would appear unduly unbalanced or incongruous within the streetscene. The proposal is of modest width, and would not create such dominant development that unacceptable harm would result to the streetscene.

It should be noted that the scheme has been slightly amended from that which was originally submitted (and was subject to public consultation). The amendment was not requested by Officers but has instead been submitted by the Applicant. The change relates to the window design of the front elevation of the proposal. The revision seeks to introduce a double storey curved bay window, similar in design and form to that which already exists. It is considered that this would more appropriately respect the appearance of the host dwellinghouse and would not alter the impact of the development from that which was consulted on.

Turning to the proposed single storey element of the proposal, this would immediately abut the existing rear projecting two storey form of the host dwellinghouse. This would result in a natural infilling of the built form of the site, without resulting in overdevelopment of the plot. Whilst the resultant form would be substantially larger than the original, it is not considered that it would appear incongruous or at odds with the built form within the locality.

On this basis, it is considered that the proposal would not result in unacceptable harm to the character, appearance or visual amenity of the surrounding area and is therefore in accordance with Policy CS16 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011) and Policy PP2 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012).

### **b) Impact upon heritage assets**

As detailed in Section 1 above, the application site lies immediately to the south of the Grade II Listed Building of No.278 Eastfield Road. Section 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, along with both national and local planning policy, requires that special regard is paid to the need for new development to preserve or enhance designated heritage assets. In this instance, it is the impact upon the setting of the Listed Building which must be considered.

At present, there is separation between the application property and No.278 of approximately 13.8 metres, with a mature line of trees and shrubbery. This acts as a natural break within the streetscene, ensuring that the setting of the Listed Building is largely contained to its own plot. The proposal would introduce new development within the intervening gap, eroding the separation to approximately 10.2 metres. However, the proposal seeks to retain the existing tree line and shrubbery along the shared boundary. The City Council's Conservation Officer has not raised any objections to the proposal. Whilst the Conservation Officer has indicated that it is preferable for the extension to be slightly set back from the host dwellinghouse, the proposal in its current form would not have an adverse impact on the setting of the Listed Building. There is a request that the detail and finish of the proposal be secured by condition and this is considered reasonable and necessary to ensure the proposal harmonises with the host dwellinghouse.

Accordingly, it is considered that the proposal would not have an adverse impact on the setting of the identified heritage asset and would therefore preserve its historic significance. The proposal is therefore in accordance with Section 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, Policy CS17 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011), Policy PP17 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012) and paragraph 131 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2012).

**c) Neighbour amenity**

As detailed above, the proposal would introduce new development adjacent to the shared boundary with No.278 Eastfield Road, partially eroding the existing separation to the host dwellinghouse. At present there is mature intervening screening by virtue of trees/shrubbery which ensures that no detrimental impact results to the amenities of neighbouring occupants either through overshadowing or overbearing impact. However, these trees are not formally protected and therefore could be felled at any time. Accordingly, it is necessary to ensure that the development results in an acceptable relationship to No.278 Eastfield Road irrespective of whether the intervening landscaping is in place or not.

By virtue of the width of the proposed extension, the side-to-side separation distance to No.278 would be reduced to approximately 10.2 metres. It is considered that this is an adequate level of separation to ensure that no unacceptably overbearing or overshadowing impact results to the windows contained within the facing elevation of the neighbouring dwelling. In addition, the amenity area associated with No.278 extends to the rear of the property, away from the siting of the proposed extension. Whilst it is accepted that the proposal would introduce two storey development in close proximity to the shared boundary, which may have some degree of overbearing and overshadowing impact, this would only occur to the side area of the garden to No.278 which appears largely unused. Furthermore, it should be noted that the existing mature tree belt already generates a significant level of overshadowing and overbearing impact owing to the height and density of the canopies. It is therefore not considered that the proposal, in the event that these trees were to be lost (which is not proposed) would generate any additional impact above and beyond the existing situation.

With regards to potential overlooking impact, which has been raised by the objector, the proposal would introduce no side facing windows at first floor level. The only facing windows proposed are at ground floor level which is the same relationship as previously approved under application reference 15/01127/HHFUL (for a single storey extension in the same position as the current proposal).

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

**d) Parking and highway implications**

At present, parking is provided to the front and side of the application site on an area of hardsurfaced driveway. By virtue of the siting of the proposed extensions, some of this existing parking provision would be lost. However, there is adequate space retained to the front of the dwelling to allow for two vehicles to park clear of the public highway. This level of parking provision accords with adopted parking standards set out in Policy PP13 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012) and as such, it is not considered that any increased pressure would result on the adjacent public highway.

With regards to turning provision, it is noted that Eastfield Road is classified and as such, the Local Highway Authority requires the provision of turning within the curtilage of the site to ensure that vehicles can enter and exit in a forward gear. However, at present there is no turning provision within the site and the proposal would not alter this situation. Therefore, the proposal would not represent any additional impact to highway safety.

On this basis, the proposal would provide adequate parking provision within the curtilage of the site and would not pose a danger to highway safety, in accordance with Policy CS14 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011) and Policies PP12 and PP13 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012).

**e) Trees**

The City Council's Tree Officer has not raised any objections to the proposal in terms of impact upon the tree line to the northern boundary of the site. The tree line is formed by a number of Cypress trees (taking the form of a hedge), an early mature Sycamore and, to the front of the site, a mature Lime tree. With regards to the mature Lime, this would not be impacted at all by the proposal as it is set a sufficient distance from the canopy and root protection area. However, there may be some impact to the remaining trees.

The Cypress hedge has already been pruned, in line with the Applicant's common law rights. The proposal, by virtue of its height and proximity to these and the Sycamore, would require further facilitating pruning owing to conflict with the tree canopies. Furthermore, future pruning would be a likelihood owing to future growth of the trees and encroachment. However, the Tree Officer has advised that none of these trees are of sufficient quality to be formally protected by virtue of a Tree Preservation Order and any pruning required is unlikely to be of such significant scale to warrant the requirement of prescriptive control.

In addition to this, at present, the area below these trees is hard surfaced through impermeable concrete. This hardstanding has already significantly disturbed the trees and the likelihood of significant roots being beneath is low. Accordingly, despite the proposal being sited in relatively close proximity to the tree line, it is unlikely to result in any unacceptable harm to the root systems.

On the basis of the above, the proposal would not result in any undue harm to landscape features of key amenity within the locality and is therefore in accordance with Policy PP16 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012).

## **6 Conclusions**

Subject to the imposition of the attached conditions, 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 proposed two storey and single storey extensions would not result in an unacceptable impact upon the character, appearance or visual amenity of the surrounding area, in accordance with Policy CS16 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011) and Policy PP2 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012);
- the proposal would preserve and not give rise to undue harm to the setting of the adjacent Grade II Listed Building, in accordance with Section 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, Policy CS17 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD

(2011), Policy PP17 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012) and paragraph 131 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2012);

- the proposed extensions would not result in an 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);
- adequate on-site parking provision would be retained and no undue harm would result to the safety of the public highway, in accordance with Policy CS14 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011) and Policies PP12 and PP13 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012); and
- the proposal would not result in an unacceptable impact to landscape features of key amenity within the locality, in accordance with Policy PP16 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012).

## **7 Recommendation**

The Corporate Director of Growth and Regeneration recommends that Planning Permission is **GRANTED** subject to the following conditions:

- C 1 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).

- C 2 The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following drawings:

- OS (Location) Plan
- Existing Floor Plans, Elevations and Block Plan (drawing number 15.030/1 Drawing 1 of 3)
- Proposed Floor Plans, Elevations and Block Plan (drawing number 15.101/2 Revision A Drawing 2 of 3)

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt.

- C 3 No development other than groundworks and foundations shall take place until samples/details of the following external materials to be used have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority:

- Walling (samples) including detailing of the brick, render, gable and decorative window surrounds and quoins;
- Roofing (samples);
- Windows (details);
- Doors (details); and
- Rainwater goods (details).

The samples/details submitted for approval shall include the name of the manufacturer, the product type, colour (using BS4800) and reference number. The development shall not be carried out except in accordance with the approved details.

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).

Copies to Cllrs Richard Ferris, John Peach and John Shearman

This page is intentionally left blank