

Application Ref: 21/00132/FUL
Proposal: Proposed 2 bed bungalow
Site: 60 Hodney Road, Eye, Peterborough, PE6 7YJ
Applicant: Mr Peter Scott
Agent: Mr John Hartley
J J & J Hartley
Referred by: **Councillor Steve Allen**
Reason: Call in if LPA are likely to recommend refusal
Case officer: Mr Asif Ali
Telephone No. 01733 4501733 207123
E-Mail: asif.ali@peterborough.gov.uk
Recommendation: **REFUSE**

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

Site Description

The application site is located to the rear of the existing dwellinghouse at No.60 Hodney Road adjacent to a substation located to the north of the application site. To the east of the application site is Woolfellhill Road, the access of the proposed bungalow would be onto Woolfellhill Road. Hodney Road is located outside of the Eye Village Boundary. and as such the application site is located outside of the village boundary too. The properties located on Hodney Road are characterised by large gardens and large properties facing onto Hodney Road. No.60 Hodney Road is located on a corner plot with Woolfellhill Road directly to the east of the site. Beyond the northern boundary of the application site and beyond the substation there is open countryside with 3 clusters of development located along Woolfellhill Road, with the closest Fell Farm approximately 163m away from the application site measured from boundary to boundary.

The application site also has a Willow which is protected by a provisional tree preservation order (TPO) 21/00003/TPO as T.1 Willow, served on 05.02.2021.

Background

A previous application ref 20/01565/FUL was withdrawn with a view to re-submit and call-in to Committee. The current application is the re-submission of the said previous application.

Proposal

The application seeks the benefit of planning permission for a proposed 2 bed bungalow with a attached garage building and associated alterations.

The proposed development would measure approximately 19.8m long, the ridge height of the development will be approximately 4.9m and the eaves height of the development will be approximately 2.45m.

2 Planning History

Reference	Proposal	Decision	Date
20/01565/FUL	Proposed bungalow	Withdrawn by Applicant	15/01/2021
03/01634/FUL 95/P0764	Two storey side extension Erection of detached bungalow	Permitted Refused	11/12/2003 06/11/1995

3 Planning Policy

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

National Planning Policy Framework (February 2019)

Section 2 – Achieving sustainable development

Paragraphs 77 to 79 - Rural Housing

Paragraph 163 - Flood Risk - Site Specific FRA

Paragraph 164 – Flood Risk for some minor development and change of use

Peterborough Local Plan (2019)

LP02 - The Settle Hierarchy and the Countryside

The location/scale of new development should accord with the settlement hierarchy. Proposals within village envelopes will be supported in principle, subject to them being of an appropriate scale. Development in the open countryside will be permitted only where key criteria are met.

LP08 - Meeting Housing Needs

LP8a) Housing Mix/Affordable Housing - Promotes a mix of housing, the provision of 30% affordable on sites of 15 or more dwellings, housing for older people, the provision of housing to meet the needs of the most vulnerable, and dwellings with higher access standards

LP8b) Rural Exception Sites- Development for affordable housing outside of but adjacent to village envelopes maybe accepted provided that it needs an identified need which cannot be met in the village, is supported locally and there are no fundamental constraints to delivery or harm arising.

LP8c) Homes for Permanent Caravan Dwellers/Park Homes- Permission will be granted for permanent residential caravans (mobile homes) on sites which would be acceptable for permanent dwellings.

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.

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.

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.

LP32 - Flood and Water Management

Proposals should adopt a sequential approach to flood risk management in line with the NPPF and council's Flood and Water Management SPD.. Sustainable drainage systems should be used where appropriate. Development proposals should also protect the water environment.

LP33 - Development on Land Affected by Contamination

Development must take into account the potential environmental impacts arising from the development itself and any former use of the site. If it cannot be established that the site can be safely developed with no significant future impacts on users or ground/surface waters, permission will be refused.

4 Consultations/Representations

PCC Tree Officer (16.02.21)

Objection-

The Willow's position on the plan would appear to be inaccurately positioned, and in fact, it is located further from the eastern boundary of the property, towards the position of the proposed dwelling.

The root protection area (RPA) of the Willow would appear to extend at least to the main roof ridge line, of the proposed dwelling and may be beyond, and in the opposite direction beyond the grass verge adjacent to the eastern boundary, possibly suggesting an off-set RPA in this area?

Please note, not only will the construction of a large part of the proposed dwelling impact upon the RPA of the Willow, but also the installation and construction work to form the new drive entrance/cross-over from the public highway, the drive, turning area and car parking space.

I object to the proposal, as I consider the proposed development will have an adverse and detrimental effect on the mature Weeping Willow, which has considerable public visual amenity value to both Hodney Road and Woolfellhill Road, and the surrounding area.

As requested previously, an Arboricultural Impact Assessment (AIA) including an Arboricultural Method Statement (AMS) should be submitted to comply with the Council's Local Plan Policy LP29 and BS5837:2012, as the proposed development will clearly have a significant impact on the RPA of the protected Willow.

PCC Peterborough Highways Services (09.03.21) (Final)

As the application is to be determined without revision, the LHA would have to raise objections to the proposals and recommend refusal for the following reasons;

RR1

As the garage is of substandard internal dimensions to be considered to provide a parking space, it has not been demonstrated that adequate facilities can be provided within the curtilage of the site for the parking and turning of 2 vehicles. As a consequence, the manoeuvring of vehicles likely to be generated by the proposed development would have an adverse effect on the safety of users of the adjoining public highway.

This is contrary to Policy LP13 of the Adopted Peterborough Local Plan.

RR2

It has not been demonstrated that an access of adequate width with appropriate vehicle-to-pedestrian visibility splays can be provided. As a consequence, the manoeuvring of vehicles likely to be generated by the proposed development would have an adverse effect on the safety of users of the adjoining public highway.

This is contrary to Policy LP13 of the Adopted Peterborough Local Plan.

Eye Parish Council (19.03.21)

Object for the following reasons-

Outside the village envelope.

Overdevelopment of the site.

Concern with the narrow access of the site.

Willow tree is incorrectly shown on the plans and should remain as suggested by the Tree Officer.

Agree with the Tree Officer's comments.

Anglian Water Services Ltd (04.03.21)

Provide comments for major applications for 10 dwellings or more, or if an industrial or commercial development, 500m² or more.

The Applicant should check for any Anglian Water assets which are cross or are within close proximity to the site. Please be advised that if there is any public sewers or a pumping station within the vicinity of the development site then any encroachment should be clearly reflected in the site layout.

North Level District Internal Drainage Board (11.02.21)

We must object to this application as no details with regards to disposal of surface water has been provided.

Michael Britton (16.02.21)

I can confirm the Application falls below the threshold for the requirement of offsite POS (non-Strategic) PCC Section 106 Contributions.

The Application would appear to not affect any existing Public Open Space but has the potential to affect PCC Landscaping (Highway Verge) please make a note on any Permission granted that no building materials are to be deposited on the verge during the construction of a dwelling unless authorized by PCC's Highway Department.

Archaeological Officer (22.02.21)

No objection in principle, subject to the implementation of an archaeological programme of evaluation by trial trench(es). Although the proposed development is relatively limited in scale, it has the potential to impact adversely on potential buried remains associated with the Roman Car Dyke, a monument of national significance.

PCC Pollution Team (17.02.21)

No objection subject to the inclusion of a unsuspected contamination condition.

Local Highway Authority (23.02.21) (Initial)

Contrary to the annotation on the drawings, there does not appear to be an existing vehicular access to Woolfellhill Road from the application site. There is an access gate, but no hard-surfaced vehicular access across the highway verge. This will require a S184 from the LHA.

- The drawing also appears to indicate that the 'exg. Vehicular access' extends across the width of the Woolfellhill Road carriageway as well as the verge.

Vehicle-to-pedestrian visibility splays of 1.5m x 1.5m are required on both sides of the access to the new property, measured from and along the highway boundary, and kept free from any obstructions over 600mm in height.

Any gates must open inwards.

As a 2-bed bungalow, the new dwelling must have 2 parking spaces, clear of the highway.

- The proposed garage is of inadequate internal dimensions (min 3m x 6m required) to be considered to provide a parking space.
- The single parking space annotated on the drawing appears to obstruct the manoeuvring of vehicles within the site.

It must be demonstrated that 2 vehicles can park and turn within the site, and the currently proposed garage could not be counted as a parking space.

Waste Management (18.02.21)

No objection.

Cambridgeshire Fire & Rescue Service

No comments received.

Local Residents/Interested Parties

Initial consultations: 13
Total number of responses: 20
Total number of objections: 19
Total number in support: 0

19 comments were received in response to the public consultation, **18** were in **objection** to the proposal and **1** comment was received **neither in support or objection** to the proposal.

Further, **1 Petition** was also received in **objection** to the proposal with 31 signatures from 25 different addresses.

The **comments objecting** to the proposal can be summarised as follows:

- Concerns about the beautiful willow tree which is part of the nature of the village, and is protected by a temporary TPO. Willow is a visual amenity and damaging a significant and prominent tree would be against the 'Environmental Capital' ethos.
- Concerns that the road is extremely muddy especially around the entrance to the field which is directly behind the property, the road floods regularly through the winter and gets quite dangerous and the amount of farming vehicles that use this road is high and regularly leaves mud.
- Vehicles visiting the site during construction would increase the flow of traffic and cause disruption, further the dust and dirt is already fairly high and this would be increased during building works.
- Nuisance and noise disruption is also concerning.
- Access is off a single track road.
- Site appears to be too small to accommodate a residential dwelling and would surely impact on the adjoining neighbour.
- Proposal seems unnecessary and unsuitable as there are more suitable sites with less impact on the local area.
- Measurements of the proposed bungalow would not appear to match the size of the proposed plot.
- Currently the property has no access onto Woolfellhill Road, which is a 60mph road, a new vehicular access point would be a safety issue to everyone using both Hodney Road and Woolfellhill Road. Public traffic has increased enormously due to lockdown, and there is no footpath or other alternative route on Woolfellhill Road.
- Surface water flooding also makes this intended entrance hazardous putting vehicles and pedestrians at an increased risk.
- May set a precedent for building in gardens which would spoil the outlook for others. The proposal could result in a ribbon of properties trickling down Woolfellhill Road, the end result would change the rural character of Hodney Road.
- Outlook of the surrounding countryside would be severely compromised.
- The proposed building will be detrimental for all neighbours.
- Both Hodney Road and Woolfellhill Road are outside of the village envelope and as such are considered a rural location.
- Other applications for additional houses in the area have always been refused.
- Proposal will have an adverse effect to our daylight, sunlight and privacy in both the garden and habitable rooms for the adjacent neighbour. The proposed bungalow would also cast a huge shadow over the garden and rooms to the rear of the property. Further the proposal which is built to the boundary fence has 3 windows to the rear and will overlook our back garden.
- Property has already been overdeveloped from the original building and has resulted in the original building being developed well over 50% of its original footprint.
- We note that an application to build a bungalow in the rear of the property has previously been submitted and refused, 95/P0764/APPEAL. There have been several applications by neighbours to build similar dwellings and these have all been refused. All houses along this road have large

gardens and therefore if this application was granted then this would set a precedent for future application. This is a quiet road in a rural area and should remain as such.

- The drainage board have commented on the lack of disposal of surface water, it is common knowledge that this section of Woolfellhill Road regularly floods causing significant damage to the grass verge which result in extreme muddy conditions and vehicles becoming stuck.
- Building of the proposal would expose the pumping house and electricity substation even more, concern also raised for the hedging which runs from the White Post Road South the full length of the rear of the properties on Hodney Road to the paddock on Woolfellhill Road which provides housing for local wildlife and the proposal could result in its removal or damage.
- Recently approached by the Applicant questioning why we had objected.
- Over 85% of the people living down the street of Hodney Road have come together and had a social distance discussion about the proposal and recent application and we are firmly against the planning.
- The proposal would be more or less built in their back garden for 62 Hodney Road.
- There are already too many houses as well as too much traffic down the road.
- The proposal will be a direct invasion of our privacy at No.58b Hodney Road as our bedroom patio doors and balcony will look straight down onto the proposed bungalow and it will also be in direct line of sight from the rear kitchen door and decking.
- The proposed bungalow's access will be opposite the access gate to our garden and will be facing directly down our land.
- Proposal would change the view of the landscape and the aesthetics of the area.
- There is no local need for this property within the road due to the extensive development to the east of Eye village and the Newborough development to the west of this part of Hodney Road offering more than sufficient alternative accommodation.

5 Assessment of the planning issues

The main considerations are:

- Principle of development
- Design and character of the site and surrounding area
- Neighbour amenity
- Highway safety and parking provision
- Future occupier amenity
- Trees
- Flood risk
- Archaeology
- Pollution Control
- Other

a) Principle of development

The application site is located outside of the village envelope of Eye as well as the boundary of the urban area as defined by Policy LP2 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019).

LP2 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019) outlines a number of exemptions which allow development to be carried out in locations outside of the village envelope. In assessing the proposal against each of these exemptions:

- The proposal is not for agricultural, horticulture, forestry, outdoor recreation and access to natural greenspace, transport or utility services purposes.
- The proposal does not meet the rural exemption test set within Policy LP8 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019).
- The proposal is not in accordance with Policy LP11 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019).
- The proposal is also not a minerals or waste development in accordance with the separate Minerals and Waste Development Plan Documents.

In light of the above it is considered that the principle of the proposal cannot be supported, as the proposal is not in accordance with Policy LP2 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019).

b) Design and character of the site and surrounding area

The proposal would be built within the rear of No.60 Hodney Road which would not respect the context of the site and surrounding area with the proposal not in keeping with the local patterns of development. The properties located on Hodney Road are served by large gardens with vehicular accesses onto Hodney Road. The existing pattern of the development keeps dwellings to the front with the large gardens allowing for a sympathetic border to the rear fields and agricultural fields to the rear of the site. The proposal would not respect the context of the site and not sit comfortably within the area.

Further, the development would result in the application site appearing to be overdeveloped and cramped in appearance due to the amount of development on site. The proposed development would measure approximately 19.8m long, the ridge height of the development will be approximately 4.9m and the eaves height of the development will be approximately 2.45m. The size and scale of the proposed bungalow would result in the proposal being overly dominant within the area and would be out of character in its design.

In light of the above it is considered that the size, scale, setting, layout and design of the proposal would result in an adverse impact on the design and character of the site and surrounding area, not in accordance with Policy LP16 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019).

c) Neighbour amenity

No.62 Hodney Road

No.62 is located to the west of the application site and is a detached property with a large garden which ends in line with the northern boundary of the application site. The proposal would be located adjacent the rear garden of No.62. The separation distance building to building at the closest point will be approximately 11m. The proposed building will be clearly visible over the shared boundary treatment given the size and scale of the proposal. It is noted that the proposal would be set off the boundary by 2m with the attached garage set off the boundary less than that, however, given the length of the entire proposed building at around 19.8m and the height of 4.9m the proposal would be dominant within the rear garden of No.62. It is therefore considered that the proposal would be overbearing by virtue of its size and scale of the development would result in an unacceptable level of impact on the adjacent neighbouring at No.62.

The proposal has 3 windows to the rear of the proposed development which will face No.62; 2 of the windows serve a bathroom and ensuite which can be reasonably conditioned to be obscure glazed and as such there will be no adverse overlooking impact. Further, the rear elevation of the proposal also has a bedroom window, however, this is a secondary window and as such it can also be reasonably conditioned to be obscure glazed to mitigate against any adverse level of overlooking into the neighbours garden.

No.58B Hodney Road

No.58B is located across Woodfellhill Road to the east of the application site. No.58B is a two storey dwelling with an access off Woolfellhill Road. The resident at No.58B raised concerns with regards impact on privacy to their main rear amenity area and rear habitable windows. It is considered that the proposed bungalow would be set beyond the rear garden boundary of No.58B and only a small portion of the proposal will be directly opposite the rear garden of No.58B. Further, the separation distance of 10m from boundary to boundary is considered sufficient to provide a reasonable separation distance to not result in an adverse overlooking impact into the main amenity area for No.58B.

In light of the above it is considered that the proposal will result in an adverse level of impact on the amenity of No.60 by virtue of the size and scale of the proposal not in accordance with Policy LP17 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019).

d) Highway safety and parking provision

The Local Highway Authority made a recommendation to refuse the proposal due to insufficient information being provided that adequate facilities can be provided within the curtilage of the site for the parking and turning of 2 vehicles, it was noted by the LHA that the garage is of substandard internal dimensions to be considered to be provide a parking space. As such the manoeuvring of vehicles likely to be generated by the proposed development would have an adverse effect on the safety of users of the adjoining public highway.

Secondly, the LHA stated that it has not been demonstrated that an access of adequate width with appropriate vehicle-to-pedestrian visibility splays can be provided as a consequence, the manoeuvring of vehicles likely to be generated by the proposed development would have an adverse effect on the safety of users of the adjoining public highway.

For the sake of clarity, the issues raised by the LHA could be resolved, however, this could potentially result in an adverse impact on the future occupier amenity by reducing the amenity area of the proposed development, which will be covered as a standalone issue, and could also result in an impact on the Willow which is protected by a provisional TPO. As such given that to resolve the issues raised above would result in an adverse level impact on future occupier amenity and the protected Tree.

Given the above it is considered that the proposal is contrary to Policy LP13 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019).

e) Future occupier amenity

As part of Policy LP17 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019) the amenity of future occupiers must be considered. The proposal is a two bed property and it is considered that the current amenity area located to the front of the application site would be insufficient for the main amenity area. The agent supplied a Site Plan providing details of the tree location and root spread, the details of which are viewed as inaccurate by the Council's Tree Officer. Taking into account the details submitted, as well as the comments of the Tree Officer and Officer's site visit, it is considered that the Willow tree would take up a large area of the main amenity area for the application site and would not allow for an adequate provision of amenity for the future occupants.

The siting of the Willow tree is also likely to result in an impact on the adequate natural light provision into the main lounge area, however, the main lounge area is served by two further windows.

Given the above it is considered that the proposal would not provide sufficient amenity provision for future occupiers and as such it is considered that the proposal is contrary to LP17 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019).

f) Trees

The Council's Tree Officer has taken the view that the position of the Willow, which is protected by a provision TPO 21/00003/TPO, appears to be inaccurately positioned and should be located further from the eastern boundary of the property towards the position of the proposed dwelling. The Tree Officer also viewed the '6 metres root spread' as identified on plan named 'Proposed Site Plan with Weeping Willow shown' as inaccurate.

The Tree Officer noted that the root protection area (RPA) of the Willow would appear to extend at least to the main roof ridge line of the proposed dwelling and may be beyond.

The Tree Officer made remarks in reference to the width of the plot, Officers measured the width of the plot at a similar place as identified on the submitted Proposed Plans and the measurement was in line with 18.6m.

The Tree Officer objected to the proposed as the construction of the proposed dwelling and the installation and construction work to form the new drive entrance/cross-over from the public highway, the drive, turning area and car parking space will impact upon the RPA of the Willow. No Arboricultural Impact Assessment was provided as part of the application, and neither any technical details were provided in reference to the construction of the proposed development to demonstrate that works can be carried out without adverse impact on the protected Willow. The Agent did request to deal with these matters by way of a condition, however, these matters would form part of the material consideration for the principle of the development and in line with Policy LP29 adequate consideration must be given to the impact of the development to any existing trees. Details have not been provided to accurately identify the extent of the RPA as well as the impact of the proposed development including the driveway.

Given the provisional TPO on the Willow and the lack of accurate technical details with regards the RPA and construction of the proposed development, it is considered that the proposal is contrary to Policy LP29 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019).

g) Flood Risk

The application site is located within Flood Zone 1, however, concerns were raised over the drainage of surface water and as such the North Level District Internal Drainage Board has objected as no details were provided with regard to disposal of surface water.

Paragraph 164 of the NPPF (2019) identifies some minor development should still meet the requirement for a site-specific flood risk assessment. Given the proposal for a new house within an area where the drainage of surface water raises concerns and the lack of details provided with this

application it is considered that the proposal is contrary to Paragraph 164 of the NPPF and Policy LP32 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019).

h) Archaeology

The Council's Archaeological Officer raised no objection in principle subject to the implementation of an archaeological programme of evaluation by trial trench due to the potential impact on potential buried remains associated with the Roman Car Dyke.

The Agent previous did indicate that they would be able to accept the above as a condition, as such the proposal is in accordance with Policy LP19 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019).

i) Pollution Control

The Pollution Control team raised no objections and recommended the inclusion of a unsuspected contamination condition. It is considered that the condition is reasonable and proportionate.

In light of the above it is considered that the proposal is in accordance with Policy LP33 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019).

j) Other

The Eye Parish Council made comments objecting to the proposal due to overdevelopment of the site as well as supporting the objection put forward by the Tree Officer, and also noting that the site is outside the village envelope and concerns over the narrow access to the site.

Whilst the majority of the neighbour comments have been addressed above some issues have not been addressed and they will be addressed below.

- Firstly, the traffic from the construction period would not be considered a reason for refusal due to the minor level of development and its temporary nature, and this would also be different from the potential impact on the Willow during the construction period which is a material consideration.
- Whilst application are decided on a case by case basis it is considered that the proposal can set a precedent within the street for similar developments.
- The extension of No.60 Hodney Road would not be a material consideration for this application.
- Planning application ref 95/P0764 did apply for the permission for the erection of a separate dwelling unit alongside No.60 Hodney Road which was refused and the appeal for that application was also dismissed, this was considered during the application stage.
- The current application does not propose the removal of any hedging which runs along the rear of the properties of Hodney Road.

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 Executive Director of Place and Economy recommends that Planning Permission is **REFUSED** for the following reasons:

- R 1 The proposal for the erection of a bungalow would be located on land outside of the Eye village envelope and outside the urban boundary of Peterborough. Further, the proposal does not meet the rural exemptions allowed under Policy LP8 and neither meets Policy LP11. The development, comprising development outside of the village envelope, is contrary to Policy LP2 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019).

- R 2 The proposal by virtue of its siting in the rear garden of No.60 Hodney Road would not be in keeping with the local pattern of development within Hodney Road. The proposal, by virtue of its size, scale and massing would create an overly dominant development that would be out of character with the context of the site and surrounding area. The development would result in the overdevelopment of the application site causing a cramped form of development. Therefore it is considered that the proposal would result in an adverse impact on the design and character of the site and surrounding area, contrary to Policy LP16 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019).
- R 3 The proposed bungalow, by virtue of its size, scale and massing sited along the boundary and in close proximity to No.60 Hodney Road would result in an unacceptable level of impact on the main amenity area of No.60 Hodney Road. The proposal would result in an adverse impact on the main amenity area of No.60 Hodney Road and would be contrary to Policy LP17 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019).
- R 4 The proposed development would result in dwellings being served by inadequate parking provision. The proposal is required, in accordance with adopted parking standards, to provide 2no. on-site parking spaces as well as turning areas to ensure that vehicles entering the site can leave in a forward gear. Insufficient information has been provided with regards the proposed parking and turning area provision on site in order to adequately assess whether the manoeuvring of vehicles likely to be generated by the proposed development can be achieved without having an adverse effect on the safety of users of the adjoining public highway. Therefore, the proposal does not provide sufficient information to demonstrate that the parking and turning areas for 2no. vehicles can be achieved on site in accordance with Policy LP13 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019).
- R 5 The proposed development has not demonstrated that an access of adequate width with appropriate vehicle-to-pedestrian visibility splays can be provided at the application site. Therefore, the manoeuvring of vehicles likely to be generated by the proposed development would have an adverse effect on the safety of users of the adjoining public highway by virtue of a substandard access with insufficient vehicle-to-pedestrian visibility splays which would result in an adverse impact on the safety of the users of the adjacent highway. As such the proposal is contrary to Policy LP13 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019).
- R 6 The proposed development has not clearly demonstrated that a sufficient amount of outdoor amenity space will be provided to the future occupiers of the application site. The size and location of the Willow tree (protected by a provisional TPO) has not been adequately addressed by the application to demonstrate that the area to the side of the proposed development would be large enough to provide a sufficient amount of outdoor amenity space for the future occupiers of the development. As such the proposal does not adequately demonstrate that the private amenity space is well designed and located, and as such is contrary to Policy LP17 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019).
- R 7 The construction of the proposed dwelling and the installation and construction work to form the new drive entrance/cross-over from the public highway, the drive, turning area and car parking space will impact upon the root protection area of the Willow tree (protected by a provisional TPO). No Arboricultural Impact Assessment was provided as part of the application, and neither any technical details were provided in reference to the construction of the proposed development to demonstrate that works can be carried out without adverse impact on the protected Willow. The necessary accurate and technical details have not been provided to accurately identify the extent of the root protection area as well as the impact of the proposed development including the driveway as well as the impact from the construction works. As such it has not been demonstrated that the construction of the proposed development and associated works can be carried out without adversely impact the root protection area of the Willow tree (protected by a provisional TPO). Therefore the

proposal has not demonstrated adequate consideration of the impact of the proposal on the Willow tree in question contrary to Policy LP29 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019).

- R8 Insufficient details have been provided with regards the disposal of surface water in relation to the proposed development. Given the location of the application site within an area of flooding caused by surface water it is considered that without the necessary details the proposed development has not demonstrated that an acceptable level of mitigation will be provided to prevent a risk of flooding caused by surface water within the area. Therefore, the proposal would be contrary to Policy LP32 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019).

Copies to Councillor Nigel Simons, Councillor Steve Allen and Councillor Richard Brown

This page is intentionally left blank