

Planning and EP Committee 24 January 2017

Application Ref: 16/02191/HHFUL

Proposal: Demolition of attached single garage and erection of two storey side extension

Site: 195 Broadway, Peterborough, PE1 4DS,
Applicant: Mr John Peach

Agent: Mr Daniel Coulling
PDG Architects Ltd

Referred by: Head of Planning Services
Reason: The applicant is an elected member.
Site visit: 14.12.2016

Case officer: Mr D Jolley
Telephone No. 01733 453414
E-Mail: david.jolley@peterborough.gov.uk

Recommendation: **GRANT** subject to relevant conditions

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

The application site is a detached dwelling of brick and tile construction, located within the Park Conservation Area. The dwelling has a driveway leading to an attached garage to side with enclosed front garden. To the rear there is an additional garage, which is accessed via the existing garage which has doors to the rear, with manoeuvring taking place in the rear garden. The rear garden is fully enclosed.

Proposal

Permission is sought for the demolition of attached single garage, erection of two storey side extension to create double garage and first floor storage room.

2 Planning History

No relevant planning history

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 72 - General duty as respects conservation areas in exercise of planning functions.**

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

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.

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.

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.

4 Consultations/Representations

PCC Conservation Officer (02.12.16)

From a heritage consideration the proposed extension is supported.

Victoria Park Residents Association

No comments received

PCC Tree Officer (16.12.16)

There are no objections to the proposal. If the application is successful and to adequately protect the retained trees from unintentional damage I recommend the inclusion of an informative which would state:

It is recommend 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.

Local Residents/Interested Parties

Initial consultations: 6
Total number of responses: 1
Total number of objections: 1
Total number in support: 0

A single objection was received in relation to the proposal stating;

the 2 garage doors shown in the rear, garden elevation of the new extension- together with the ability to "run-through" the existing garage with doors to both front and rear, is it proposed that vehicles will be taken into the rear garden to access the new garage?

The submitted D & A Statement does not address this, neither do the plans show any hard surfacing in the rear garden. I therefore would be grateful for clarification that vehicles will not enter the rear garden and that the 2 new proposed "garages" are really only stores/outbuildings rather than intended to be used to park vehicles on a regular basis. Perhaps a Condition to this effect would be something you might consider

Manoeuvring cars in the rear garden would necessitate car headlights and engine noise which would have an adverse impact on the owner of no. 191 where I understand that the bedrooms are at the eastern end of this bungalow.

5 Assessment of the planning issues

The main considerations are;

- The impact of the proposal on the character of the Park Conservation Area
- The impact of the proposal on the setting of a locally listed building
- The impact of the proposal on the amenity of the occupiers of neighbouring dwellings

The impact of the proposal on the character of the Park Conservation Area

The roof of the proposed garage will be visible from the front of property as one travels along Broadway from the west. Much of the bulk of the garage roof will be screened by the local listed substation directly in front of the proposed garage. The garage is set back 10 metres from the public realm and will not be prominent or incongruous within the streetscene.

The extension itself is appropriately detailed and incorporates features such as the shaped barge boards found on the host dwelling. The applicant proposes to use matching materials, which is considered to be the correct approach in this instance.

The Conservation Officer has raised no objection to the proposal and has stated that the work will not unacceptably harm the character of the Park Conservation Area.

The impact of the proposal on the setting of a locally listed building

The proposed extension will be partially visible to the rear of the locally listed building in some views from Broadway. The roof of the extension will be the main visible feature and its uniformity will not draw the eye unduly from the locally listed building. The design of the roof has meant that much of it will be screened by the locally listed building itself and it is considered that the roof scape will not appear bulky or incongruous.

The Conservation Officer has raised no objection to the proposal and has stated that the work will not significantly detract from the setting and an appreciation of the locally listed building.

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

The existing garage to the side of the large existing brick built garage has deteriorated and is in need of replacement. This garage is reached through the brick built garage connected to the host

dwelling. The existing patio area to the rear of the dwelling is used as a manoeuvring area. This a historical arrangement, that has been in existence for some time, given the age of the garage to be demolished and the doors to the rear of the brick built garage. It is also noted that no permission would have been required to create this run through to the brick built garage.

The proposal will bring the garage closer to the boundary of 191 Broadway. This may result in slightly increased noise from manoeuvring and disturbance from headlights as stated by the objector, however, it is considered that these detriments are unlikely to be materially harmful and in essence is very similar in principle to the existing arrangement. It is noted that the boundary between the application site and 191 Broadway is a close board fence which should screen the majority of any headlight illumination.

The garage itself is located close to the boundary shared with 191 Broadway and is relatively tall, with an eave height of 3.0 metres. However these dwelling have south facing gardens and the level of morning overshadowing caused by the garage is not considered to be materially harmful and is unlikely to unacceptable overshadow the primary habitable room windows of the neighbour. The neighbour has a side window that faces towards the garage but this is located 10 metres from the proposed garage and as such it is considered that the garage will not be unacceptably overbearing when viewed from this window. Although some loss of outlook is noted, it is not severe enough to warrant the refusal of the application. The 1st floor window will not permit unacceptable overlooking of neighbouring amenity space.

Given that the proposal only expands upon what is an existing arrangement the Local Planning Authority are of the view that it is not reasonable or necessary to impose conditions limiting the use of the garage and that the proposal will not be materially worse for nearby neighbours in terms of noise disturbance and nuisance from headlights.

Other matters

Much of the rear garden and the trees within appear to be outside of the Conservation Area and as such do not benefit from statutory protection. Notwithstanding this, the submitted plans indicate no trees for removal and it is unlikely that these trees will be significantly impacted upon by the development. The Tree Officer has raised no objection to the proposal but has requested an informative that retained trees are protected by fencing. This informative has been added to the decision notice.

A single objection was received in relation to the proposal, some of the points raised have already been addressed within this report. The objector also requested a revised plan showing the extent of the existing and proposed manoeuvring area to the rear of the dwelling. This was subsequently submitted by the applicant.

In order to preserve the character of the conservation area, permitted development rights for the insertion of roof windows will be removed by way of condition.

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 proposal will not unacceptably harm the character of the Park Conservation Area, setting of a locally listed building or the amenity of the occupiers of neighbouring dwellings; in accordance with policies CS16 and CS17 of the Peterborough Core Strategy (DPD) 2011 and policies PP2, PP3, PP12 and PP17 of the Peterborough Planning Policies (DPD) 2012 and section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act (Conservation Areas).

7 Recommendation

The 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 shall be carried out in accordance with drawings; 16051/PL01A and 16051/L(--) 01B.

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt.

- C 3 The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the garage 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).

- C 4 Notwithstanding the provisions of Part 1 Class C of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (or any Order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification), no windows shall be inserted into front and side facing roof slope of the permitted extension other than those expressly authorised by this permission or those expressly authorised by any future planning permission.

Reason: In order protect the amenity of the adjoining occupiers or the visual amenity of the area, in accordance with Policy CS16 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011) and Policies PP2 and PP3 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012).

Informatives

- 1 It is recommend 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.

Copy to Cllrs Ferris, Peach and Shearman

This page is intentionally left blank