

Application Ref: 21/00832/HHFUL

Proposal: Proposed two storey and single storey rear extension, loft conversion with the installation of roof lights and alterations to the front porch

Site: 40 Westwood Park Road, Peterborough, PE3 6JL,
Applicant: Mr Mohammed Imran

Referred by: Councillor Mahboob Hussain
Reason: Conditions could be applied to bring the development into accordance with the Local Plan

Agent: Mr Paul Sharman, Sharman Architecture
Site visit: 06.07.2021

Case officer: Mrs Shaheeda Montgomery
Telephone No. 01733 4501733 453410
E-Mail: Shaheeda.Montgomery@peterborough.gov.uk

Recommendation: **REFUSE**

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

Site and surrounding area

The surrounding area on Westwood Park Road is characterised by properties of generous proportions, generally set within large plots and benefitting from deep, well-proportioned rear gardens. The properties are generally sited with approximately 6-10m set back from the road and there is a variety of architectural design styles and features. The application site and adjoining properties at 38 and 42 Westwood Park Road have been extended in the past with built development close to the side boundaries.

The application site is located close to but not within the Westwood Park Special Character Area

It comprises a detached two-storey four-bedroom gable fronted dwelling set back from the highway with a gravelled area to front and a side driveway leading to a detached single garage sited toward the rear of the dwelling. The front driveway can accommodate two car parking spaces. A 6.5m x 6.5m summer room abuts the garage on its rear elevation with a gable end roof. The property itself has been previously extended and benefits from a large rear garden.

Pre-amble

The initial scheme which was submitted for approval included:

- alterations to the front elevation to create an enclosed porch;
- the removal of the existing garage and summer room and replacement with a ground floor rear extension. This extension would project beyond the existing rear wall by 12.8m;
- a first floor level rear extension projecting beyond the rear wall by 5.7m to create two ensuite bedrooms;
- a loft conversion for an additional two ensuite bedrooms with Velux rooflights.
- an annexe sited next to the rear boundary with dimensions of 6.45m deep x 10.81m width to accommodate a gym, shower room, sauna, kitchen and seating area.

The applicant was requested to remove the proposals for the annexe, to reduce the depth of the first floor extension by 1m and to reduce the depth of the ground floor extension in line with the rear extension at 42 Westwood Park Road.

Proposal

Officers have worked proactively with the applicant and a revised scheme was submitted for determination. The revised scheme removes the annexe entirely and reduces the depth of the first floor extension, however, the applicant has not agreed to reduce the depth of the ground floor extension.

The current proposal would create a seven bedroom property. It would still provide for two car parking spaces on the driveway. The proposed roof and facing materials would match the existing dwelling. The various elements of the proposals would comprise:

- alterations to the principal elevation to create an enclosed porch;
- the removal of the existing garage and summer room and replacement with a ground and first floor rear extension. The proposed extension would extend the existing dwelling to the south by 1.7m;
- the ground floor rear extension would have an overall depth of 12.8m providing an open plan kitchen, dining and living area. Part of the ground floor extension would project 8m beyond the first floor extension with a flat roof to a height of 3.2m;
- the first floor rear extension would extend by a reduced depth of 4.7m providing 2 ensuite bedrooms. It would have a hipped roof to match the existing dwelling;
- loft conversion for two ensuite bedrooms with rooflights;

Following referral of the application to Committee, the Applicant has submitted minor revised drawings. These amend a discrepancy between the floor plans and elevations in terms of the width of the first floor rear Juliette balconies, but also reduce the height of the single storey rear element along the northern boundary with No.42 Westwood Park Road (parapet removed, thereby lowering by 300mm). These amendments have not been subject to revised public consultation.

2 Planning History

Reference	Proposal	Decision	Date
96/P0825	Erection of conservatory and new detached garage/garden room/playroom (as amended by revised plans received 6 January 1997 - drawing number TL/P96/01A)	Permitted	11/03/1997
98/00546/FUL	Rear extension (including garage, conservatory and garden/play room)	Permitted	18/06/1998
05/01955/FUL	Two storey front extension	Permitted	03/02/2006

3 Planning Policy

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

Peterborough Local Plan 2016 to 2036 (2019)

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.

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 (06.07.21- first round consultation)

No objection owing to the fact that it does not impact on the nearby Special Character Area – however, advice provided to case officer and agent on ways to substantially improve the proposals for front elevation.

PCC Tree Officer (23.08.21)

Concerns regarding the location of proposed annexe near to trees on the neighbour's plot.

PCC Conservation Officer (03.09.21- revised plans)

No objections.

It is noted that only some of the previous comments were taken on board and incorporated within the proposed plans however none of the minor alterations is considered to affect the previous position.

Local Residents/Interested Parties

Initial consultations: 7

Total number of responses: 6 (from four neighbours)

Total number of objections: 6 (from four neighbours)

Total number in support: 0

First round of consultations to the initial scheme:

The first round of consultations to the initial submission received five letters of representations from four neighbouring residents raising objections based on the following concerns:

1- The outbuilding:

- the outbuilding at the rear of the site which has all the facilities and is sufficiently sized for a single dwelling, the proposals have potentially 8 double bedrooms giving a capacity for 16 people.
- The location of a building at the bottom of the garden, as the rear outbuilding is shown, is not in character with other properties in Westwood Park Road.
- The outbuilding appears to be a further dwelling in that it has all the amenities to serve as a permanent dwelling.
- It is described as a Gym/Relaxing Area but has kitchen/toilet/shower facilities. As it is a permanent structure, this could be very easily converted into a permanent residential use once planning officers have completed their final inspections. In any event, given the close proximity to the main house, there is no need to have such kitchen/toilet/shower facilities included if this is the true intention. We believe this outbuilding is intended ultimately to be additional residential accommodation, and strongly object.
- However, of more concern is the fact that the outbuilding's windows face back towards the rear of our house. In doing so, it infringes on the privacy of our first-floor bedroom windows that look out onto our rear garden, and where our children dress and sleep.
- We calculate this outbuilding to be 2.5 metres high, which is almost 1 metre higher than the existing fence between our properties. This will overshadow our garden and our ground floor extension roof lights.

2- Size of the development:

- The footprint of the proposal occupies 50% of the area of the site which is clearly out of character for Westwood Park Road and raises concerns of over development given that the area is characterized by dwellings on large mature landscaped plots.
- The proposed outbuilding at the rear of the garden directly infringes our privacy to the rear of our property. Specifically our master bedroom on the first floor, bathroom and child's bedroom. According to the plans, the outbuilding will have a glass frontage that will allow occupants to look out directly into the rooms affected, thus infringing on our privacy. The outbuilding specifically is out of character with other properties on Westwood Park Road.
- The outbuilding has a kitchen and bathroom and therefore has the potential for permanent dwelling.
- there are no clear measurements of the height of the outbuilding but clearly the elevation will be higher than the existing fence which is approximately 6ft in height and therefore quite imposing.
- The development of a 7-bedroom house and the outbuilding at the bottom of the garden is an over development of the site, it being out of character with other properties in Westwood Park Road. The plans show that the ground floor foot-print has more than doubled in size and overall the buildings occupy over half of the site, in conflict with policy 6.15.5 of the Local Adopted Plan.
- The first-floor extension on the plans extend over 2 metres beyond the existing established building line at the rear of our property, and will be overbearing and overshadow our first floor bedroom window and our ground floor extension roof lights at that end of our property.

3- Neighbour amenity impact:

- The plans for the first-floor extension are overbearing to our rear ground floor conservatory and therefore infringe on our privacy.
- The proposed plans for the kitchen indicate two windows adjacent to our conservatory. It's unclear from the plans the dimensions of the windows and whether they would infringe on our privacy.

4- Parking:

- The site can only safely park 3 cars and given its likely occupancy the proposals will increase the on-street parking.
- In addition- to have an eight bedroom dwelling implies the need for many cars. The current parking space at the front would allow for probably 3 cars so I suspect there may be more parking

of cars in the future on the roadside which could cause danger to pedestrians and cyclists by impeding the view of the road.

5- Trees:

-Westwood Park Road is enhanced by the mature trees and planting both in rear and front gardens which adds to the attractiveness and character of the area for residents and visitors alike. It also forms a green corridor which attracts a substantial amount of wildlife.

- In recent months, prior to this application, the applicant completely stripped the trees and planting from both the front and rear gardens of no.40. Given the proximity to the special character area of Westwood Park Road this should be reinstated. If this is allowed to continue as a trend then there will be a significant loss to the character of Westwood Park Road which will not be sustainable for wildlife and will be detrimental for the wellbeing of residents.

- Our garden is mature. We have established planting and two very large trees (one approx 70 years old) in close proximity to the plans of the outbuilding. We are concerned they might be at risk due to the building works, foundations and infrastructure that's needed in order to supply the necessary services to the building, e.g. plumbing, drainage etc. Furthermore, one tree will be overhanging the proposed outbuilding and therefore within falling distance (as well as trees from the adjacent property on Thorpe Avenue).

- I object to trees being cut down indiscriminately in old established gardens before planning permission is granted and worry that further extensive building on this plot will increase the risk of surface flooding. This is a very green area of the city-an "Environment City"- and it seems a great pity to lose garden space in favour of buildings.

- We have an established mature garden and are concerned that the extent of the building works will damage our existing plants/bushes and mature tree.

- Westwood Park Road is categorized as a 'Special Character Area' in planning terms, as noted in clause 6.15.5 of the Local Adopted Plan, and whilst this property is not located within the area it is close to the boundary of it and therefore contributes to the local character. The Special Character Area refers to large spacious landscaped gardens. It should be noted that since the applicant purchased the property in March 2021, the existing mature landscaped garden has been stripped out and burnt on site prior to this application being submitted, as were all mature trees which were felled.

6- Other matters:

- More generally the plans lack clear dimensions, elevations, and an indication of the distances from the boundaries.

- There are no distances of the extension or of the outbuilding from the boundary.

Given the proximity of the works to our house, we are subject to a notice being served on us under the Party Wall Act 1996 etc. Would you please advise.

In addition, **Councillor M Hussain** requested that the application be referred to Committee for the following reason:

“If we were to refuse the application then we can set some conditions of amendments for the applicant to comply with so that applicant would be satisfying the planning requirements.”

Second round of consultations to the revised scheme:

Three letters of representations were received raising the following concerns.

1- Size and design of proposal:

- Whilst I admire the ambition of the plans, I do think these designs indicate the property will be overbearing. It doesn't feel like the site is large enough to accommodate the ambitious scale of the design

- I note your Conservation Officer's comment regarding the front central first floor window and as an architect would concur with his view.

- I would withdraw my objections to the overdevelopment if the proposed extensions were reduced in depth back to the natural building lines at ground and first floor levels and the second floor

accommodation removed.

2- Neighbour amenity impact:

- I also still have concerns over the boundary line of the proposals, specifically the first floor. The first floor extends out further than our property, and the Juliet balconies outlined will overlook our conservatory, a room in which we use as a family frequently and therefore potentially infringes our privacy.
- This is an overdevelopment of the site. In addition, the current plans indicate that the single storey extension will tower almost 1.5 metres above the existing 1.8 metre wooden boundary fence between the two properties. This will have an over bearing and detrimental effect on the light to our single storey extension at that end via our windows and roof lights, and will affect the use and amenity of the area which is used as a communal play area by our children and their friends.
- Given the proximity of the proposed works to No. 42 generally, for consistency, the proposed first floor extension should not extend beyond the building line of the existing double storey extension at the rear of No.42. This will also remove any potential overlooking issues via our windows and roof lights at that end where our children congregate.
- The rear elevation plans are incorrect in that the windows and Juliet balconies to bedrooms 1 & 2 do not match the revised first floor plan. I am concerned that if the Juliet balconies to bedrooms 1 & 2 are approved there will be a temptation to remove these at a later date and use the roof of the single storey extension as an accessible balcony. Again, this will create overlooking issues for No.42 via our windows and roof lights at that end of our property where our children congregate. Removal of any use as an accessible balcony should be specifically included as a condition should the applicant be granted any permission.
- The single storey ground floor extension appears to extend almost 5 metres forward of the natural building line of the single storey elements of no's 38 and 42.
- The single storey extension scales 1.5 metres higher than the fence between no's 40 and 42 and as such will not only overshadow no 42 it will be overpowering given its proximity to the boundary

3- Parking:

- I'd like to reiterate my concerns over the parking implications that come with a development of this size. Parking on the main road is already an issue on the street and it is extremely difficult to exit our property at peak times during the day. I fear there is risk this will become more of an issue in the future.
- The applicant is demolishing the existing garage and proposing to build out towards the boundary with No.38. Six or seven vehicles will not be able to park off road on the site, and in any event there is a single yellow line parking restriction running along the road immediately outside No.40
- In addition the objections raised in my previous correspondence on the public portal regarding potential capacity and parking remain as before.

4- Trees:

- I also welcome the report from the tree officer and look forward to seeing a planting scheme to reinstate some natural screening between boundaries, though I am concerned that it might be difficult to do so due to the plans proposed.
- Any permission granted to the applicant should include a time limit within which this (Tree Officer's recommended) condition should be implemented - a suggestion is that this landscaping scheme should be implemented within the first planting season following completion of any main works.
- Also I concur with the Tree Officer's comment regarding adding a condition to provide a suitable and appropriate landscaping scheme. Any condition should include a time limit for implementation of the landscaping scheme eg. within the next planting season following completion of the building works.

5- Other matters:

- I welcome the revised plans and the removal of the outbuilding, and more generally the consideration to address our concerns. It's appreciated.
- The proposed ground floor and first floor new wall extensions abut right up against the boundary line between the two properties, leaving merely the width of a house brick on the applicant's side.

The wooden fence boundary line between us is the responsibility of the applicant, Mr Imran. However, of major concern for me is the fact that part of the boundary between the two properties is a brick wall that forms part of my living room structure. The outer surface of that wall forms part of the boundary at ground floor level. There are two main objections to the position of this new wall extension. Firstly, the living room structure/brickwork that forms the boundary is long established and is part of the structural integrity of my property. As this is our family living room it is also where our family mainly gather, so there is a use and amenity aspect to this issue. According to the applicant's plans, the gap between the applicant's new wall and our existing wall is approximately the width of a house brick. Digging fresh footings so close to my existing boundary wall will undermine the structural integrity of my property at this point and consequently affect the use and enjoyment of our family living room area.

- Secondly, I am advised that a gap of 1.5 metres as a minimum should be established between any new wall extension and our existing boundary wall and wooden fence boundary to prevent any such settling or other structural damage to my property following any new works. In addition, the advantage of having such a minimum gap will enable both the applicant and myself to gain adequate access between our respective properties to maintain and repair our respective walls. The Access to Neighbouring Land Act 1992 (as amended) permits access to adjoining or adjacent land for the purpose of carrying out maintenance or preservation works to one's own property. The applicant's current plans would prevent me from being able to carry out my legal rights as the gap is wholly insufficient for anyone to carry out any such works. To be unable to carry out maintenance or prevention works on this boundary wall would have a detrimental effect on the value of my property. As the City Council is the local planning authority in this matter, it has a duty to act reasonably and to avoid issues that can cause conflict between neighbours. This issue is one of them, and I would respectfully request that a step back gap of a minimum 1.5 metres as indicated above would be the solution to this matter.

- In any event, the ground floor and first floor plans do not align. The ground floor proposals do not appear to be able to support the first floor proposed works?

- Please take into account the objections I have referred to above, and I would respectfully request that the City Council planning department, acting reasonably, consider the applicant's plans carefully with a view to avoiding issues that will cause conflict between the applicant and myself as neighbours.

- It should be noted that the extents of the single storey extension shown on the ground floor and first floor plans do not match

- Whilst I note that the first floor extension has been reduced in depth this still extends forward of the natural building line at first floor level

- The rear elevation is incorrect in that the windows and Juliet balconies to Bedrooms 1 & 2 do not match the revised first floor plan

5 Assessment of the planning issues

The main considerations are:

- Design and impact on the character of the site and surrounding area,
- Neighbour amenity
- Highway safety and parking provision
- Trees
- Other matters

a) Design and impact on the character of the site and surrounding area

The application site is in close proximity to the Westwood Park Road Special Character Area. Accordingly, the Council's Conservation Officer was consulted on due to the proximity of the application site to the Special Character Area and has not raised any objections.

The proposed development would be of large proportions and Officers note the proposal would change an existing four bedroom dwelling into a sizeable seven bedroom with en-suite bathrooms

and result in a footprint which would be larger than adjacent properties on Westwood Park Road. Notwithstanding, the increase in the footprint of the dwelling would be 45%, and as a proportion of the available open space, the proposed scheme would not lead to the overdevelopment of the application site itself. It would, however, bring the extent of potential development on the site close to its limit before resulting in adverse impact on the amenity of the site and surrounding area.

Officers note that properties along the western side of Westwood Park Road immediately north of the application site are generally built up to span the width of the plots and do not provide for visual relief by way of gaps between the properties. As such, there is evidence of existing development with roof eaves which overhang the boundary line or development which are sited on or hard up against the boundary line.

The generous size of the application site itself would be able to absorb the current proposal whilst retaining an adequate portion of the garden amenity space, which would be in character with the existing development pattern of the area, where development is sited across the width of the plot towards the front and with sizeable open garden to the rear. In addition, Officers note that the main volume of the proposed development would be to the rear of the existing dwelling as well as absorbed within the loft conversion and hence, it would not impact significantly on the streetscene or the wider public realm. However, the outlook from the rear garden spaces in the surrounding would be altered by the massing of the proposal and by virtue of this proposed development projecting further out from the predominant building line as existing along the rear of the properties on the west side of Westwood Park Road.

The proposed alterations to the principal elevation and to enclose the existing porch would not be widely viewed from the streetscene owing to the 6m setback from the public footway. Furthermore, although the application site is situated in close proximity to the Westwood Park Road Special Character Area, in light of the mixed variety of design and features in evidence within the streetscene, these proposed alterations would not be considered to have an unacceptable level of harmful impact on the setting and surrounding area. The Council's Conservation Officer's comments also support Officers view that the proposed development would not have an unacceptably adverse level of impact on the setting and surrounding area and would not be of significant level to warrant a refusal. On the basis of the above, Officers do not consider there is justification to secure further amendments regards to the principal elevation.

The proposed development would be finished in facing brickwork with roof tiles and fenestration to match the host dwelling which would ensure that the proposed alterations would be integrated into the existing dwelling without appearing awkward or incongruent.

On the basis of the above, it is considered that on balance the proposal would be in accordance with Policy LP16 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019).

b) Neighbour amenity

The main impact of the proposals would be on the occupants of 38 and 42 Westwood Park Road which are considered in turn below.

42 Westwood Park Road

No.42 is located due north of the application site and benefits from a two storey and single storey rear extension sited close up along the shared boundary. The single storey rear extension contains a kitchen and living area with an outdoor seating area and garden beyond.

The proposed first floor level rear extension would project beyond the rear wall of the existing two-storey development at No.42 by 1.1m. The proposed single storey rear extension would project beyond the existing rear wall of the ground floor extension at No. 42 by an additional 4.5m.

At first floor level, Officers note that considering the 45 degree rule and the 1.1m additional depth

of the projection of the proposed first floor extension, the proposed scheme would not result in a significant loss of light, overshadowing or overbearing impact on the amenity of the first floor bedrooms and ground floor kitchen and living area of this adjacent property. Furthermore, whilst the existing ground floor extension at No.42 incorporates roof lights, only one roof light situated closest to No.40 would be affected by some level of overshadowing for a limited time of the morning. Furthermore, Officers note that the roof lights are not the primary source of light and outlook to these main habitable spaces due to there being windows and bi-fold doors facing the garden.

The proposed ground floor extension would project 4.5m beyond the rear wall of the kitchen and living area at No.42, and this proposed development would be sited 310mm from the boundary fence. The extension, at 3m in height, would be 1.3m higher than the level of the existing timber fencing. The siting, orientation and massing of the proposed single storey rear extension would result in an unacceptable level of harm and overbearing impact on the neighbour at 42 Westwood Park Road's outdoor seating area as well as from the living and kitchen area within. Officers are of the view that the minor reduction in height by 300mm from the earlier scheme, is not sufficient to prevent the harm identified.

No.38 Westwood Park Road

This southward adjacent property comprises of a two-storey dwelling with a rear conservatory. The existing garage and summer room at the application site is located 150mm from the shared boundary. The existing summer room already projects forward of the conservatory at 38 Westwood Park Road with eaves height of 2.5m sited next to the boundary.

The proposed first floor level rear extension would have its rear wall projecting 0.5m further from the rear wall of the dwelling at No.38. Considering the orientation, scale and depth of this additional projection beyond the line of existing development at No.38, the proposed scheme would not result in adverse level of overbearing or overshadowing impact on the living accommodation of the neighbouring property.

Looking to the proposed ground floor extension, it is noted that the existing garage and summer room are located close to the shared boundary. The proposed ground floor extension would be in line with the existing rear wall of the summer room albeit with a greater relief between the two properties, with a gap of approximately 1.2m. Considering the height of the existing hipped roof of the garage and summer room along the southern boundary, and the proportions of the proposed scheme in the same position, the proposal would not result in an unacceptable level of overbearing or overshadowing impact on this southward neighbour than the current situation.

Impact of Juliette Balconies

The proposal would include two Juliette balconies on the first floor level which have received objections from both adjacent neighbours. There are four existing rear windows on the first floor level of the host dwelling, with the window closest to No.42 serving a main habitable room and the rest serving bathrooms. Therefore, Officers acknowledge that a degree of overlooking currently exists. Whilst the proposed development would further extend the building line at first floor level to the rear; the potential for overlooking and loss of privacy impact on the neighbouring properties would not be adversely increased by the siting of the Juliette balconies. Officers note that the concerns around this element of the proposal also hinge on the potential for the flat roof of the proposed ground floor extension being altered in future to provide accessible space as a balcony. Therefore, in the event of this application being approved, a condition would be added to prevent increased loss of privacy in case future alterations may lead to an accessible roof or creation of a balcony, with the condition secured in perpetuity.

There are objections from adjacent neighbours regards to overlooking of the conservatory or rear extension at the neighbouring properties from the Juliette balconies. The Juliette balcony nearest No.38 would be located approximately 4.2m from the south boundary of the application site. The

Juliette balcony nearest to No.42 would be sited approximately 1.4m away from the north boundary. Officers note that the viewing angle from these Juliette balconies, considering the location as well as the eye level of a person standing at the first floor level looking towards the conservatory at No.38 or the roof lights on the rear extension at No.42 would be relatively narrow. Officers note that a degree of overlooking is possible, albeit not enough to warrant a refusal based on the existing fall-back position of existing windows and the viewing angle from the proposed balconies.

Based on the above, Officers note that whilst the potential for overlooking as well as a degree of overshadowing impact would result from the proposal, these would not be of an unacceptably harmful level to justify a refusal. However, Officers would consider that the proposed scheme would result in unacceptable level of harm to the enjoyment of the outdoor amenity space of 42 Westwood Park Road as it is located immediately next to the proposed single storey rear extension. The single storey extension, by virtue of the proposed depth, mass and height; would result in an overbearing impact on the neighbouring property and as such, the proposal as submitted would not accord with Policy LP17 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019).

c) Highway safety and parking provision

The proposed development would increase the number of bedrooms to seven whilst a small existing garage would be removed as part of the proposal. Notwithstanding, the internal dimensions of the existing garage would not comply with current car parking standards set by the Council. In addition, the Council's parking standard requirement for new residential dwellings with upwards of four bedrooms is two on-site spaces.

The application site benefits from gravelled area to the front of the dwellinghouse, of clear dimensions of approximately 6m deep x 13m wide with access off the carriageway. Therefore, based on the Council's parking standards for residential dwellings of similar size, Officers consider there to be adequate on-site car parking space available to the occupants which comply with the Council's parking standards and therefore, the proposal would not lead to highway safety issues, in accordance with Policy LP13 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019).

d) Trees

It is noted that officers sought consultation from the Council's Tree Officer with regards to the initial scheme submitted due to this former scheme consisting of a proposed annexe sited close to mature trees which were within the neighbouring properties. The Tree Officer has made a note of the trees and greenery which has been felled or removed from the application site in recent weeks and made recommendations to secure a landscaping plan to replace these lost trees/greenery by way of a condition. A site visit conducted in July showed evidence that there had been some tree felling in recent weeks however, the trees felled on the application site did not have Tree Protection Orders nor do they form part of a woodland area. Furthermore, aerial views of the area from before the trees were felled show that these trees were not within or near to the siting of the proposed development.

Officers have deliberated on the matter and consider that whilst trees and greenery would contribute positively to the urban setting and environment, and that the felling of the existing trees on the application site were regrettable, the activities were carried out before the application could be assessed or site visit carried out, and in the absence of an existing Tree Protection Order, Officers would not be able to justify such a condition in this instance for a residential dwelling.

Based on the above, it is considered that on balance, the proposal would accord with Policy LP29 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019).

e) Other matters:

Representations received from neighbours also included the following concerns:

- Concerns regarding proposed development sited against boundary and request from No.42 that the Council should mediate between the neighbours towards Party Wall notice.

The proposed scheme has been assessed on planning merits and Officers would not be able to mediate between neighbours over planning applications as this is a matter outside of the planning assessment. A proposal sited close to a shared boundary would be subject to serving notice under the Party Wall Act 1996. However, this would be a civil matter between adjacent neighbours and separate from obtaining a planning permission and thus, would not fall within the remits of assessing this planning application. If the application is successful, an informative on Party Wall Act 1996 would be included with the decision notice issued by the planning authority for the benefit of the applicant.

Furthermore, at the request of the neighbours, contact details of occupants of No.42 were passed on to the applicant via the agent handling the application on his behalf. Officers have explained to the neighbours that mediation between neighbours would not be a matter which the Council can intervene in.

- Concerns regarding that ground floor plans do not support the first floor plan, drawings lacking dimensions, etc, and incorrect locations of windows etc.

The submitted scheme has been assessed for the purposes of planning approval and officers note that the information and level of details provided in the application drawings fall within the minimum standards required to validate the application as per the Council's application guidance for the purposes of a planning assessment. Officers are would not assess details regarding construction, structural stability as part of planning assessment. Where discrepancies have been found at a level which would affect the Council's ability to approval submitted drawings, Officers have approached the applicant for revised drawings to remove any doubts.

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 case officer recommends that Planning Permission is **REFUSED** for the following reason:

- R 1 The proposed development, by virtue of its siting, height, scale and orientation of the single storey rear extension, would result in an unacceptably overbearing impact to the adjacent residential dwelling of No.42 Westwood Park Road. The proposal would result in significant overbearing impact to the immediate outdoor seating area and main habitable spaces located to the rear of the property such that unacceptable harm to the amenity of occupants would result. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy LP17 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019).

Copy to Councillors Mahboob Hussain, Amjad Iqbal and Mohammed Jamil

This page is intentionally left blank