

Item No.3

Planning and EP Committee 1 September 2020

Application Ref: 20/00782/HHFUL

Proposal: Erection of a single storey detached double garage with attached covered walkway, first floor extension and single storey rear extension with conversion of existing garage

Site: 1 Rectory Lane, Glinton, Peterborough, PE6 7LR

Applicant: Mr John Holdich

Agent: Mr Scott Whight

Reason: **The Applicant is a Ward Councillor**

Site visit: 01.07.2020

Case officer: Mr Asif Ali

Telephone No. 01733 4501733 207123

E-Mail: asif.ali@peterborough.gov.uk

Recommendation: **GRANT** subject to relevant conditions

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

Site Description

The application site is a mid to late 20th century chalet bungalow style dwelling located on Rectory Lane off High Street and is within the Glinton Conservation Area. The application site is one of four similar design chalet bungalows found Rectory Lane, however, there is a presence of different architectural styles around the application site including The Blue Bell as well as other listed buildings directly opposite the application site. The application site is the first dwelling located on the east side of Rectory Lane and is closest to the High Street giving it a prominent position.

Proposal

This application seeks the benefit of planning permission for the erection of a single storey detached double garage with attached covered walkway, first floor extension and single storey rear extension with conversion of existing garage.

Amendments were made to the originally submitted plans in line with the recommendations made by the Council's Principal Conservation Officer. The Conservation Officer was of the view that the original linear design elongated the application dwelling which is already a linear building as existing. This is especially important due to the close proximity of the host dwelling to the highway and that it is the first dwelling on the east side of Rectory Lane, thus forming a prominent feature in views. Not least it is within the setting of listed buildings opposite and to the north-east (the Bluebell).

Given the concerns raised by the Conservation Officer in relation to the scale and dominant elongation of the property within the street scene, revised plans were submitted, which effectively detaches the garage from the house by a short distance and sets it back from the building line, creating some visual separation. It also lowers the roof pitch and introduces a more subservient material for its elevations, above a brick plinth which would match the host dwelling.

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 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.

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

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

National Planning Policy Framework (2019)

189. In determining applications, local planning authorities should require an applicant to describe the significance of any heritage assets affected, including any contribution made by their setting. The level of detail should be proportionate to the assets' importance and no more than is sufficient to understand the potential impact of the proposal on their significance. As a minimum the relevant historic environment record should have been consulted and the heritage assets assessed using appropriate expertise where necessary. Where a site on which development is proposed includes, or has the potential to include, heritage assets with archaeological interest, local planning authorities should require developers to submit an appropriate desk-based assessment and, where necessary, a field evaluation.

190. Local planning authorities should identify and assess the particular significance of any heritage asset that may be affected by a proposal (including by development affecting the setting of a heritage asset) taking account of the available evidence and any necessary expertise. They should take this into account when considering the impact of a proposal on a heritage asset, to avoid or minimise any conflict between the heritage asset's conservation and any aspect of the proposal.

192. In determining applications, local planning authorities should take account of:

- a)** the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and putting them to viable uses consistent with their conservation;
- b)** the positive contribution that conservation of heritage assets can make to sustainable communities including their economic vitality; and
- c)** the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness.

193. When considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation (and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be). This is irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance.

Supplementary Planning Documents

Design and Development in Selected Villages SPD (2011)

Peterborough Local Plan (2019)

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.

LP19 - The Historic Environment

Development should protect, conserve and enhance where appropriate the local character and distinctiveness of the area particularly in areas of high heritage value.

Unless it is explicitly demonstrated that a proposal meets the tests of the NPPF permission will only be granted for development affecting a designated heritage asset where the impact would not lead to substantial loss or harm. Where a proposal would result in less than substantial harm this harm will be weighed against the public benefit.

Proposals which fail to preserve or enhance the setting of a designated heritage asset will not be supported.

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.

LP13d) City Centre- All proposal must demonstrate that careful consideration has been given to prioritising pedestrian access, to improving access for those with mobility issues, to encouraging cyclists and to reducing the need for vehicles to access the area.

LP29 - Trees and Woodland

Proposals should be prepared based upon the overriding principle that existing tree and woodland cover is maintained. Opportunities for expanding woodland should be actively considered.

Proposals which would result in the loss or deterioration of ancient woodland and or the loss of veteran trees will be refused unless there are exceptional benefits which outweigh the loss. Where a proposal would result in the loss or deterioration of a tree covered by a Tree Preservation Order permission will be refused unless there is no net loss of amenity value or the need for and benefits

of the development outweigh the loss. Where appropriate mitigation planting will be required.

4 Consultations/Representations

PCC Conservation Officer (28.07.20)

No objections - From a heritage perspective, the main considerations are the size and scale of the development, the impact of such on adjacent listed buildings and the conservation area and the material appearance of the works.

I have no particular concerns in relation to the proposed first floor extension on the right hand side of the dwelling. The strange existing false pitch looks poor and running a new roof at the same pitch as the existing is indeed supported. There remains sufficient breathing space between it and the neighbouring property not to look cramped.

The main issue on the original proposal was the impact of a garage addition to the left hand side of the dwelling, which acted to overly elongate what's already a rather linear building as existing. This is especially important due to the close proximity of the host dwelling to the highway and that it is the first dwelling on the east side of Rectory Lane, thus forming a prominent feature in views. Not least it is within the setting of listed buildings opposite and to the north-east (the Bluebell).

Owing to concerns in relation to the scale and dominant elongation of the property within the street scene, revised plans have been submitted, which effectively detaches the garage from the house by a short distance and sets it back from the building line, creating some visual separation. It also lowers the roof pitch and introduces a more subservient material for its elevations, above a brick plinth which would match the host dwelling.

Whilst there is still a definite linear form to this property, the garage being somewhat separated from the host building, set back behind the building line, with a lower ridge line, does indeed reduce this impact and dominance within the street scene substantially.

The parish council have raised concerns in relation to the materials proposed, specifically timber cladding and also to the lower roof pitch than the house. I understand their concerns, but would state that running the garage off the building as originally proposed creates an overly elongated and unrelieved house with an unnecessarily tall and dominant garage roof.

The fact that the garage is being set back and will not run in line with the main building, will make it less dominant and the different roof pitch less obvious. The substantially lower roof will allow much of the proposed garage to be disguised behind the boundary hedging.

Materially, the modern bricks would look somewhat stark against the traditional bricks of the pub in such close proximity. Horizontal timber boarding is an historic material used for ancillary and agricultural buildings and provides a softer transition and respects the hierarchy of buildings on site, as opposed to harsher brickwork. The use of matching bricks to the plinth and matching roof tiles to the house is considered to tie the building in materially.

I certainly think the timber cladding is least obtrusive option here, due to its softer and natural appearance, which sits better in the rather verdant surroundings and within close proximity to the side elevation of the listed Bluebell pub.

A condition should be appended to any permission for materials to be submitted and approved in writing. The garage doors have not been considered as should be so as not to detract.

Glinton Parish Council (22.07.20)

Objection - On the basis of the latest revised plans only; Glinton parish council are opposed to the application and note the revised incongruous roof angle of the proposed detached garage compared to the main dwelling. In particular parish council are opposed to the use of wood cladding as shown on the revised plans.

Reasons for our objection are that the revised plans do not comply with adopted planning policy as stated in the Supplementary Planning Policy (SPD) document entitled "Peterborough Design & Development in 13th selected villages" adopted by the planning authority on June 2011 and confirmed to be extant planning policies.

Planning Policies stated in the SPD and considered to be relevant are:

PD2, Building detail should complement and where possible enhance its surroundings
BM1, Building materials which affect the character of the conservation area (Materials are listed and do not include timber of any description)
BM3, Building materials.....would normally be expected to match those within the area

Specific to Glington are policies relating to the character of Glington; where even in references to agricultural buildings as well as houses "*.....it is the combination of 17th and 18th century stone buildings and stone walls grouped beside the twisting roads which meeting at the church green and give Glington its special character and appearance*" - No mention of timber.

GLIN1 "*The design of any new building or extension should be sympathetic to its neighbours and in keeping with the village character.....*"

GLIN2 "*Traditional building materials appropriate to surrounding buildings must be used.....*"

GLIN3 "*Architectural and historic style must be maintained on extensions to protect the particular character of the individual building*" i.e. with like design and materials to the building being extended

GLIN7 *The design of extensions and outbuildings should take into account not only views from the road but also other public view point's such as footpaths or open space* – particularly relevant to the angle of the roof of the garage extension when viewed from the North

GLIN10 "*For extensions to existing buildings, brickwork and stonework should match the existing materials of the main building style.*"

Parish Council Observations

For the above planning policy reason the parish council are OPPOSED to the application in its current form.

Parish council would have NO objections to the original plans which are entirely in keeping with other like properties on the EAST side of Rectory Lane and complimentary to the street scene. Furthermore the Parish Council consider the original application to be wholly compliant with the above Planning Policies

If minded to pursue the current revised plans for the garage part of the application, then the parish council would have less objection if the timber finish were to be replaced by finish in the same material as the main dwelling. Parish council would still have concerns about the visual appearance of the roof Angle compared to the main dwelling.

Noting that this application is to go to the Planning & Environmental Protection Committee, Glington parish council reserve the right to representation at the committee; but would support Officers if they were to recommend approval of the original submitted plans.

PCC Enforcement Team

No comments received.

Local Residents/Interested Parties

Initial consultations: 3

Total number of responses: 1 (Parish Council)

Total number of objections: 0

Total number in support: 0

No comments or representations were received from local residents to the original or revised schemes.

5 Assessment of the planning issues

The main considerations are:

- Design and impact to the character and appearance of the site and the surrounding Glington Conservation Area
- Neighbour amenity
- Highway safety and parking provision
- Trees

a) Design and impact to the character and appearance of the site and the surrounding Glington Conservation Area

The application site is situated within the Glington Conservation Area. Under Section 72(1) of the Town and Country Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (as amended), as such special regard must be paid to the desirability of preserving conservation areas such as the Glington Conservation Area. In addition, given the quantity of listed buildings within the surrounding area such as Red House 12 Rectory Lane, The Bluebell 10 High Street, 8 Rectory Lane, 10 Rectory Lane and the Grade I Listed St Benedict's Church, Section 66(1) of the Town and Country Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (as amended) requires special regard to the desirability of preserving listed buildings, their special features and their setting, in accordance with the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework (2019).

The Council's Conservation Officer advised that the original linear design with regards the proposed garage elongated the application dwelling which is already a linear building as existing. The Conservation Officer viewed this as especially important due to the close proximity of the host dwelling to the highway and that it is the first dwelling on the east side of Rectory Lane, thus forming a prominent feature in views. Not least it is within the setting of listed buildings opposite and to the north-east (the Bluebell). Amendments were made to the originally submitted plans in line with the recommendations made by the Council's Principal Conservation Officer.

Given the concerns raised by the Conservation Officer in relation to the scale and dominant elongation of the property within the street scene, revised plans were submitted, which effectively detaches the proposed garage from the house by a short distance and sets it back from the building line, creating some visual separation. It also lowers the roof pitch and introduces a more subservient material for its elevations, above a brick plinth which would match the host dwelling. The subservient material would be timber cladding. Officers are of the view that the use of the timber cladding also results in a material finish found commonly on ancillary buildings, ensuring an acceptable relationship between the application site and the proposed detached garage as well as the proposed garage and The Bluebell which is in close proximity.

The first floor extension and garage conversion element will be finished in matching materials to the existing dwellinghouse which Officers consider acceptable.

Full details of all materials have been requested by the Conservation Officer, Officers consider this to be appropriate, necessary and reasonable to secure under a planning condition to ensure these materials do not adversely impact upon the setting of surrounding designated heritage assets.

Glington Parish Council (PC) objected to the proposed materials and the roof angle of the proposed detached garage which the PC state would be incongruous in relation to the main dwelling whilst the wood cladding does not comply with the Design & Development in Selected Villages SPD (2011). The Principal Conservation Officer's view, with regards the material finish, is based on the matter that the annex is an ancillary building and timber materials on a matching brick plinth represents a historic method of constructing outbuildings, which would not compete with other

buildings in the surrounding area given its scale, in accordance with Glin 2 of SPD Policy-Glinton within the Design & Development in Selected Villages SPD (2011). Therefore, Officers consider that the horizontal timber boarding is acceptable.

Paragraph 190 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2019) states that Local Planning Authorities should identify and assess the significance of any heritage assets that may be affected by a proposal and take this into account when considering the impact of a proposal on a heritage asset, to avoid or minimise any conflict between the heritage asset's conservation and any aspect of the proposal. The Conservation Officer's recommendations take into account the surrounding heritage assets by recommending a detached garage finished in timber cladding and the amended roof design ensures that the proposed detached garage appears as an ancillary building in a suitable material finish which appears sympathetic to the surrounding heritage assets especially The Bluebell. Officers consider that the proposal minimises any conflict between the heritage asset by virtue of its subservient design and material finish, therefore that the proposal is in accordance with Paragraph 190 of the NPPF (2019).

Further, to counter the unacceptable elongation of the proposed application site which would have impacted the balance and design of the site as well as the surrounding heritage assets a detached garage was proposed. A detached garage with the same roof design and pitch as the existing dwelling would have been a prominent and incongruous feature within the street scene given the steep pitch design, hence the roof design as well as the material finish result in a clearly subservient and ancillary building which is not prominent within the street scene and does not impact on the balance of the application site as well as the surrounding heritage assets.

Finally, the application site is located behind No.4 Rectory Lane, which appears to be a building of a commercial nature, and the associated car parking, and a large grass verge when viewed from High Street. The views of 1 Rectory Lane with the street scene are generally at an angle. Therefore the setback location of the garage as well as its lower roof design and materials all ensure that the views of the proposed detached garage are not prominent and of an ancillary building sympathetic to the application site and the surrounding heritage assets. Officers consider this to be in accordance with Glin 1 and Glin 7 of the SPD Policy-Glinton within the Design & Development in Selected Villages SPD (2011).

Whilst Glinton Parish Council raised no objections to the original scheme, given the reasons above, the original scheme was not acceptable to Officers.

In light of the above, Officers consider the proposal to be in accordance with Policies LP16 and LP19 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019), Design and Development in Selected Villages SPD (Glinton) (2011) and Paragraph 190 of the NPPF (2019).

b) Neighbour amenity

No.3 Rectory Lane

No.3 is located to the south of the application site and is a chalet bungalow in the same design as the application site. The proposal would result in a first floor extension which would introduce a front and rear bedroom window at first floor level which would serve the same bedroom. However, given the layout of the application site and No.3, as well as the current relationship between the two properties, Officers are of the view that there will not be any adverse level of unacceptable overlooking and would not adversely impact upon the relationship between the two properties.

The Bluebell No.10 High Street

The Bluebell is located to the northeast of the application site and is a large Public House. The proposed garage would be located close to The Bluebell which is located close to the application site and it was noted on site that two windows were located along the shared boundary that overlooked into the application site. Previous plans submitted on a planning application in 2016 indicate that the two windows serve an open area outside the WCs. Officers consider that the location of the garage as well as the existing relationship which is the windows being located

behind an approximately 1.8m high fence ensure enough mitigation to ensure that there is no adverse level of overbearing or blocking of natural light.

Officers are of the view that with regards the other neighbours, given the separation distances of the proposal as well as the size and nature of the development there will not be an adverse level of unacceptable impact on the amenity of the adjacent neighbours.

In light of the above Officers consider that the proposal is in accordance with Policy LP17 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019).

c) Highway safety and parking provision

The proposed garage conversion would result in the loss of a parking space but the proposed detached garage is a double garage and makes use of an existing vehicle access. Officers therefore consider that the existing situation is not made worse by the proposal in terms of highway safety and parking provision and would on balance be an improvement given the replacement of a garage with a double garage.

In light of the above Officers consider that the proposal is in accordance with Policy LP13 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019).

d) Trees

A large Sycamore is located on The Bluebell's side of the boundary with the application site but as viewed from Officers site visit the crown and roots of the tree come within the application site. However, a notification to carry out works to trees within a conservation area was submitted under reference 20/00784/CTR for the felling of the Sycamore in question, the Council's Tree Officer raised no objections to the felling of the Sycamore.

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 impact of the proposal on the character of the area is considered to be in accordance with Policies LP16 and LP19 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019); and
- The impact of the proposal on the amenity of the occupiers of neighbouring dwellings is considered on balance to be in accordance with Policy LP17 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019).

7 Recommendation

The Executive Director of Place and Economy 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 Plan
- Existing Site Plan/Block Plan (Drawing number 01)
- Proposed Site Plan/Block Plan (Drawing number 02 Revision A)
- Existing Ground Floor Plan (Drawing number 03)
- Existing First Floor Plan (Drawing number 04)
- Existing Elevation (Sheet 1 of 2) (Drawing number 05)
- Existing Elevation (Sheet 2 of 2) (Drawing number 06)
- Proposed Ground Floor Plan (Drawing number 07 Revision A)
- Proposed First Floor Plan (Drawing number 08 Revision A)
- Proposed Elevations (Sheet 1 of 2) (Drawing number 09 Revision A)
- Proposed Elevations (Sheet 2 of 2) (Drawing number 10 Revision A)

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

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

The samples/details submitted for approval shall include the name of the manufacturer, the product type, colour (using BS4800) and reference number. Any samples submitted shall be made available for inspection on site by the Local Planning Authority. 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 Policies LP16 and LP19 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019).

Copies to Ward Councillors Hiller and Holdich

This page is intentionally left blank