

Application Ref: 18/01436/HHFUL

Proposal: Two storey rear extension and alterations to dwelling

Site: 7 Latham Avenue, Orton Longueville, Peterborough, PE2 7AD

Applicant: Mr A Reed

Agent: David Setchfield

Referred by: Councillor Elsey

Reasons: Loss of privacy and overbearing impact to neighbours.

Site visit: 14.09.2018

Case officer: Mr Jack Gandy

Telephone No. 01733 452595

E-Mail: jack.gandy@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 comprises a detached chalet bungalow located adjacent to the turning head of the cul-de-sac. The property is set back approximately 11 metres from the public highway, which this allows for the provision of on-site car parking as well as front garden. To the rear of the property, the bungalow is served by a sizeable rear garden, measuring approximately 34 metres in depth. Detached bungalows are characteristic of the surrounding street scene, with two storey detached dwellings located further to the west.

Proposal

Permission is sought for the construction of a two storey extension to the rear of the dwelling, along with alterations to the existing dwellinghouse:

i) Two storey extension - The existing rear conservatory and pitched-roof extension, together measuring 5 metres in depth, would be demolished. The proposed two storey extension would have an overall depth of 7.2 metres from the original rear elevation of the dwellinghouse. The extension would measure approximately 5.7 metres in width. The roof to this extension would be hipped, with the ridge line proposed to measure 5.9 metres from ground level and the eaves to be 4.4 metres high above ground level. Four rooflights would be installed onto this elevation, with three rooflights proposed to the north-facing roof elevation and one rooflight to the south-facing elevation.

ii) Alterations - To the existing front facing dormer, the central double-hung window would be replaced with two top-hung windows and the adjacent panel to the front door would be replaced. The internal wall separating the existing living and dining room would be removed to allow a larger living room, amongst over layout changes.

Revisions

The original drawings submitted have been altered to reduce the scale of the proposal. The proposed ridge has been dropped to be approximately 0.3 metres less than the dwelling's existing ridge height. In addition, the depth of the extension has been reduced by 1.0 metre.

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.

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.

PP13 - Parking Standards

Permission will only be granted if appropriate parking provision for all modes of transport is made in accordance with standards.

Peterborough Local Plan 2016 to 2036 (Submission)

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 Proposed Submission version of the Local Plan took place in January and February 2018. The Local Plan was submitted to the Secretary of State on 26 March 2018. A Planning Inspector has been appointed and the Local Plan is going through the Examination stage to establish whether it is 'sound', taking all the representations into consideration.

Paragraph 48 of the National Planning states that decision makers may give weight to relevant policies in an emerging plan according to:-

- the stage of the Plan (the more advanced the plan, the more weight which can be given)
- the extent to which there are unresolved objections to the policies
- the degree of consistency between emerging policies and the framework.

The policies can be used alongside adopted policies in the decision making process, especially where the plan contains new policies. The amount of weight to be given to the emerging plan policies is a matter for the decision maker. At this final stage the weight to be given to the emerging plan is more substantial than at the earlier stages although the 'starting point' for decision making remains the adopted Local Plan.

LP13 - Transport

LP13a) New development should ensure that appropriate provision is made for the transport needs

that it will create including reducing the need to travel by car, prioritisation of bus use, improved walking and cycling routes and facilities.

LP13b) The Transport Implications of Development- Permission will only be granted where appropriate provision has been made for safe access for all user groups and subject to appropriate mitigation.

LP13c) Parking Standards- permission will only be granted if appropriate parking provision for all modes of transport is made in accordance with standards.

LP16 - Urban Design and the Public Realm

Development proposals would contribute positively to the character and distinctiveness of the area. They should make effective and efficient use of land and buildings, be durable and flexible, use appropriate high quality materials, maximise pedestrian permeability and legibility, improve the public realm, address vulnerability to crime, and be accessible to all.

LP17 - Amenity Provision

LP17a) Part A Amenity of Existing Occupiers- 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.

LP17b) Part B Amenity of Future Occupiers- Proposals for new residential development should be designed and located to ensure that they provide for the needs of the future residents.

4 Consultations/Representations

Orton Longueville Parish Council

No objections: Orton Longueville Parish Council has no comments to make on this application.

Local Residents/Interested Parties

Initial consultations: 10

Total number of responses: 5 (Councillor Elsey and neighbours)

Total number of objections: 2 (Councillor Elsey and a neighbour)

Total number in support: 0

One letter of representation was received from a local resident who object to the proposal on the following grounds:

- Strongly object to a double storey dwelling being erected.
- It will take away all of the neighbour's privacy to the rear garden and they will not be able to use their rear garden
- Property devaluation.
- There would be no problem with a single storey extension given that there are bungalows either side of No. 7 Latham Avenue.

A second letter of representation was submitted by **Councillor Elsey**, who has 'called-in' the application on the following grounds:

- Loss of privacy to neighbours.
- The windows from the proposed extension and Juliet balcony will be looking straight into the bedroom of the adjoining property and will leave nearly 60% loss of privacy to their gardens.
- This is already the only two story building in the cul-de-sac and this extension will make the property overbearing.

The other letters of representation submitted by neighbours relate to general enquiries, requesting

weblinks to view the plans online and whether any amendments had been made to the proposal.

5 Assessment of the planning issues

The main considerations are:

- Design and impact to the character and appearance of the site and the surrounding area
- Neighbour amenity
- Parking provision

a) Design and impact to the character and appearance of the site and the surrounding area

The proposed extension would be a large addition to the rear of the chalet bungalow. However, it is considered on balance that the proposed design would respect the proportions of the host property. This is through the proposed ridge line being less than the existing ridge line to the main house, along with the width of the proposed extension to be less than the width of the existing dwelling. The proposed 7.2 metre depth of the extension would be 2.2 metres further in depth than the existing arrangement to the rear of the property, which includes the existing dual pitched extension and conservatory.

However, given its position to the rear of the dwelling, the proposed extension would not readily be visible to view from the public realm. With the proposal to be constructed in materials to match, it is considered on balance that the proposed 7.2 metre extension would not unacceptably impact upon the character and appearance of the surrounding street scene. The alterations to the front dormer are considered to be acceptable.

Although Officers consider a more subservient extension could be achieved, the proposal is considered to be in accordance with Policy CS16 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011), Policy PP2 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012) and Policy LP16 of the emerging Local Plan (Examination Stage) (2018).

b) Neighbour amenity

The curtilage of the site is surrounded by residential neighbours, with No. 6 Latham Avenue and No. 8 Latham Avenue located either side of the application site. To the rear of site is Shrewsbury Court.

i) No. 6 Latham Avenue

No. 6 Latham Avenue is the adjacent neighbour bungalow to the north. The boundary between this dwelling and No. 7 Latham Avenue comprises waney fence panels and vegetation. An outbuilding is also situated between the two dwellings. Given these two factors, it is not considered that the ground floor windows to the proposal would unacceptably impact upon the privacy of the adjacent neighbour. With regards to the three rooflights, the centre of each rooflight would be approximately 2 metres above floor level. This is considered to be acceptable to ensure the privacy of the adjacent neighbours.

The projection of the proposed extension, along with the position of the two dwellings, means that the proposal diverges away from the neighbour towards the rear of the property. At its nearest point however, the proposed rear extension would be approximately 7.5 metres from the side elevation of the neighbouring bungalow. Given this distance, it is not considered that the proposed two storey extension would be unacceptably overbearing to the neighbouring house and given the diverging extent of the proposal, it is not considered that the proposal would cause adverse overbearing to the rear garden.

Given that No. 6 Latham Avenue is north of the application site, it is not considered that adverse levels of shadowing would impact upon the dwelling from the proposal, given that such shadows would be at their shortest during mid-day periods. Furthermore, given the separation of the

proposal from the shared boundary, it is not considered that unacceptably high levels of shadowing would impact upon the neighbouring garden.

ii) No. 8 Latham Avenue

This bungalow is to the south of the application site. The two properties at their nearest point are approximately 2.6 metres apart from each other. The proposed extension would be set approximately 4.7 metres from the boundary. The boundary is comprised of close board fencing along with vegetation maintained at a higher level. The orientation of No. 8 Latham Avenue means that the rear of this neighbour diverges further away from No. 7 Latham Avenue, therefore between the two dwellings there would be a greater separation distance. Notwithstanding this matter, the 4.7 metre separation is considered to be sufficient to avoid the proposal being adversely overbearing to the adjacent property. In addition, given that the proposed extension would be north of No. 8 Latham Avenue, it is not that adverse levels of shadowing would impact upon the neighbour or their rear garden.

No. 8 Latham Avenue has three windows to its side elevation. Two windows serve the ground floor bathroom, with the other side window serves a bedroom. The bedroom is also served by larger window to the front elevation of the property. One rooflight, side door and two additional window openings are proposed on the south-facing elevation of the extension to No. 7 Latham Avenue. To the ground floor, the two windows and a door are proposed to the kitchen and breakfast/family area. It is considered that the existing boundary treatments would acceptably screen the lower ground floor windows to avoid unacceptable loss of privacy. With regards to the rooflight, the centre of the rooflight would be 2 metres above floor level. This is considered to be sufficient to avoid overlooking impacts to the neighbouring property and its garden.

The Juliet balcony proposed to the rear would gain some views to the neighbouring garden to the south. The position of the existing decking area to the rear of the No. 8 Latham Avenue would be partially screened by the existing single storey extension serving No. 8 Latham Avenue, but it is considered that the use of this area would be retained. Furthermore, permitted development rights allow for first floor windows and dormers to be installed to the rear of dwellings. It is considered that whilst there would be some harm to the privacy of the neighbouring garden, that harm is not considered to be unacceptable.

iii) Shrewsbury Court

Shrewsbury Court is east of the applicant dwelling. There would be approximately 18.5 metres from the rear elevation of the proposal to the nearest residential unit within Shrewsbury Court. Given this separation distance along with the sizeable rear garden, it is not considered that the proposal would cause adverse overbearing impacts or unacceptable levels of shadowing to these neighbours. Furthermore, the proposed Juliette balcony is considered to be sufficiently distant from these dwellings to ensure no unacceptable loss of privacy.

In light of the above, the proposal is considered on balance to be in accordance with Policy CS16 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011), Policy PP3 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012) and Policy LP17 of the emerging Local Plan (Examination Stage) (2018).

c) Parking provision

The front elevation of the dwelling is approximately 10.3 metres from the public footway to the west. There is existing hard-surfacing to the front of the dwelling to allow for the provision of two vehicles to park on site in a tandem arrangement.

Under PCC's car parking standards, two car parking spaces of an acceptable size are required to serve a dwelling with two or more bedrooms. With this proposal, the dwelling would have three bedrooms, which is the same as the existing situation. With the dwelling already providing sufficient parking provision, there is no requirement to provide additional parking on-site.

On the basis of the above, the proposal is considered to be in accordance with Policy PP13 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012) and Policy LP13 of the emerging Local Plan (Examination Stage) (2018).

Other matters

- Property devaluation - This is not a material planning consideration.

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 would not unacceptably impact upon the character and appearance of the site and the surrounding area, in accordance with Policy CS16 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011), Policy PP2 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012) and Policy LP16 of the emerging Local Plan (Examination Stage) (2018).
- The adjacent neighbours to the site would not be adversely impact upon by the proposed development, in accordance with Policy CS16 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011), Policy PP3 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012) and Policy LP17 of the emerging Local Plan (Examination Stage) (2018).
- Two on-site parking spaces would be retained, in accordance with Policy PP13 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012) and Policy LP13 of the emerging Local Plan (Examination Stage) (2018).

7 Recommendation

The Case Officer 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 approved plans:

- Location and Site Plan (Drawing number AR/0718/01 Revision B)
- Existing Plans and Elevations (Drawing number AR/0718/02)
- Proposed Elevations (Drawing number AR/0718/02 Revision C)
- Proposed Floor Plans (Drawing number AR/0718/04 Revision C)

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.

- C 3 The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the two storey rear extension 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).

Copy to Councillors Casey, Elsey and Walsh.