

**Application Ref:** 21/01745/HHFUL

**Proposal:** Part two storey side and part first floor extension to incorporate existing garage - resubmission

**Site:** Jubilee House, First Drift, Wothorpe, Peterborough  
**Applicant:** Mr & Mrs D Boothman

**Referred by:** Wothorpe Parish Council  
**Reason:** The proposals are in contravention of the relevant planning policies in terms of design and neighbour amenity

**Agent:** Ms Helen Raymond, RAW architecture Ltd

**Site visit:** 21.06.2021 and 23.07.2021

**Case officer:** Mrs Shaheeda Montgomery  
**E-Mail:** shaheeda.montgomery@peterborough.gov.uk

**Recommendation:** **GRANT** subject to relevant conditions

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

**Site and surrounding area**

The application site is located within Wothorpe village, a designated Special Character Area. A private access leading off First Drift allows for a minimum 58m setback from the highway and the site comprises of a one and a half storey dwelling of contemporary design and benefitting detached double garages to the front and an enclosed rear garden. The site is slightly elevated to the south west as evident by the level difference seen in the rear garden, with the dwelling slightly 'set in' to the ground to its rear.

Terracotta House, a Locally Listed Building is located to the north west, close to the highway edge. Planning application reference 12/00885/FUL is the final root application which approved the erection of Jubilee House within the land which was formerly the rear garden of Terracotta House.

Tarrants is the neighbouring dwelling located adjacent and eastwards of Terracotta House with Les Coquelicots sited due east and Arkengarth and St Martins Lodge due west.

**Proposal**

The proposal seeks the benefit of planning permission to raise the roof level of the existing dwelling to create a first-floor level to accommodate additional living spaces consisting of 3nos. ensuite bedrooms and associated internal alterations to the existing layout. The gap between the existing detached garage and the principal elevation would be infilled with a part two-storey development which would abut the rear wall of the garage.

In addition, the scheme includes alterations to the existing double garage from a dual pitch roof to a single pitch roof with 2nos. roof lights and the creation of a mezzanine level for a 'Hobby Room'. The proposed roof of the garage would follow the existing dwelling in height and pitch as seen on the north elevation.

The finishing materials would consist of a combination of limestone and cream render, ashlar quoins, aluminium cladding and aluminium powder coated window frames, which would match the

existing dwelling.

It should be noted that the current application is a re-submission of application reference number 21/00583/HHFUL which was previously withdrawn, and amendments have been secured as part of this application as well.

The initial proposal submitted has been revised after discussions between the Officers and the Applicant to reduce the scale of the development proposed on its north (principal) elevation as well as a reduction in scale of the windows on the east elevation.

## **2 Planning History**

<b>Reference</b>	<b>Proposal</b>	<b>Decision</b>	<b>Date</b>
08/00101/FUL	Detached bungalow and garage	Refused	20/01/2009
11/01877/FUL	New four bedroom property with double detached garage plus double garage for existing Terra Cotta House	Permitted	30/03/2012
12/00885/FUL	Construction of a four bedroom property with double detached garage - Revised	Permitted	01/08/2012
21/00583/HHFUL	Part two storey side and part first floor extension to incorporate existing garage	Withdrawn by Applicant	24/08/2021

## **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 16 - Impact on Designated Heritage Assets**

Local Planning Authorities should take account of the desirability of sustaining and enhance the significance of heritage assets and putting them to viable uses consistent with their conservation, the positive contribution that conservation of heritage assets can make to sustainable communities including their economic viability and the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness. When considering the impact of development great weight should be given to the assets conservation. This is irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance. Any harm to or loss of the significance of the designated heritage assets should require clear and convincing justification. Where a proposed development will lead to substantial harm to the designated heritage assets permission should be refused unless it can be demonstrated that substantial harm or total loss is necessary to achieve substantial public benefits that outweigh that harm. Where harm is less than substantial this harm should be weighed against the public benefits including securing an optimum use of the asset.

### **Peterborough Local Plan 2016 to 2036 (2019)**

#### **LP13 - Transport**

#### **LP16 - Urban Design and the Public Realm**

#### **LP19 - The Historic Environment**

#### **LP20 - Special Character Areas**

## Wothorpe Village Design Statement (2006)

## Peterborough Design and Development in Selected Villages SPD (2011)

### **4 Consultations/Representations**

#### **PCC Tree Officer (23.11.21)**

No objection on arboricultural terms - The site is not within a Conservation Area, however, there is a Tree Preservation Order (TPO) on the site, which protects a number of trees within the rear garden. These trees will not be impacted upon by the above proposal. Also, do not believe the smaller trees growing adjacent to the neighbouring boundary at Tarrant's will be adversely affected by the works to carry out the proposals.

#### **PCC Conservation Officer (03.12.21 and 21.12.21)**

No objection - There is a concern regarding the proposed increase in scale of the existing garage and the limited positive design features on the principal north elevation. However, it is noted an interesting corner window does add interest to what remains a large blank elevation. The proposed alterations to an extent detract from the setting of the heritage asset.

The revisions to the north elevation are an improvement, and no objections are raised.

#### **Wothorpe Parish Council (12.01.22)**

Objection - The proposals are in contravention of the relevant planning policies of the Design and Development in Selected Villages SPD 2011, Section 13 Wothorpe:

- VDS2 Scale: The PC considers that the height of this proposal due to its two-storey development would significantly affect the immediate environment and be in contravention of the above policy.
- VDS 3 Relationship between buildings. The PC considers that the proposals provide an adverse relationship between Jubilee House, and the three adjacent properties, Tarrant's, Terracotta House and Friarfields, as outlined by the objections of those property owners.
- VDS 6: Building lines. The PC considers that inappropriate attention has been given to the views and vistas of the adjacent properties which are considered detrimental.

In addition, SA19 Special Character Area: The PC considers that the proposals would harm the appearance of the Area and that the scale massing and spacing of the existing properties is compromised.

#### **PCC Tree Officer (04.01.22)**

No objection.

#### **Local Residents/Interested Parties**

Initial consultations: 7

Total number of responses: 6

Total number of objections: 6

Total number in support: 0

Two rounds of consultations have been carried out.

#### First Round

The first round of consultations to the initial scheme received three letters of objections from three neighbouring residents raising the following concerns.

- *the massing of the building would be very close to our site boundary.*
- *the current re-submission reduces the massing but there would still be a high wall bearing down on our garden.*

- the windows would have extensive visibility over our rear garden.
- we would be pleased to see the scale of it reduced, the second storey stepped back and the windows overlooking our garden removed/ relocated.
- we do not believe that anything has changed (from the root application for erection of the dwelling at Jubilee House) that should now allow these protective measures to be reversed.
- Visual images in the Design and Access Statement show a large window on 2 elevations at the front of the house which are not shown on proposed layout plans
- We believe this planning application alters the relationship between the neighbouring Locally Listed Building as considered under the original planning application (root application for the erection of Jubilee House) resulting in overlooking impact and would not be sympathetic
- the additional floor will reduce our privacy and we will be affected by loss of light
- adequacy of site access and privacy to construction vehicles along our shared access drive
- there is planning permission agreed on the original planning permission for Jubilee House for an additional garage to be built in Terracotta grounds that we would not want affected by this planning permission as this is something we intend to proceed with shortly and may need taken into consideration as part of this planning application.
- The existing single storey building does not overlook our property, the gardens, the paddock, the tennis court, nor the pool. The proposed south elevation shows a much larger and higher upper structure with a large bedroom window and an en-suite window which would overlook our property and would be particularly acute for the large part of the year when trees are not in full leaf.
- In addition, the 4 new proposed high windows on the new 1st floor, on the east elevation, would also overlook us and would be very much closer to us given the far greater size and proximity, of the proposed upper structure and would be close to Jubilee House's eastern boundary.
- The height of the proposed east facing wall appears to be c. double the height of the existing wall. The length of the proposed wall, at the new height appears to be c. 3 times longer than that of the current, lower, wall and very close to the boundary. It would be quite oppressive.
- the proposed east elevation would be radically different in character. It would be a solid, rather 'unsympathetic, higher and longer wall, thereby causing the 'overbearing' objection.
- The 4 proposed overlooking windows would also be overbearing as they would be significantly closer to us than the existing windows.
- our long countryside views towards the north-west and north would be affected.

### Second round

A second round of consultation was carried out regards to revised scheme which received a further three letters of objections from the same neighbouring residents raising the following concerns:

- there has been some reduction in the proposals, but concern remain for the height and closeness of the extended elevation overlooking our garden with windows looking directly into the garden.
- still maintain that this is a single-storey property with basement and the scale of new proposal would overbear or dominate.
- The ground level at the rear of Terracotta and adjacent (driveway/shared access) is already on a higher level and therefore can overlook.
- We would also like to raise that there is planning permission agreed on the original planning permission for Jubilee House for an additional garage to be built in Terracotta grounds and that this would not be affected by this planning permission, as this is something we intend to proceed with shortly and may need taken into consideration as part of this planning application.
- The most relevant change to us is the proposed reduction in size of the windows in the proposed additional storey on the East elevation.
- With regard to our 'overlooking' objection smaller windows, on the East elevation of the proposed 1st floor, continue to allow 'overlooking', and would reduce our privacy.
- On the South elevation there appears to be no changes, so we continue to object to the proposed 1st floor as the proposed windows would overlook our property, reducing our privacy.
- With regard to our 'overbearing' objection, the proposed East facing wall would be very close to the Eastern boundary and would be more than double the area of the current wall. The current wall

*is relatively unobtrusive because of the hedge. However, the majority of the extra area of the proposed wall would be above hedge height, very close to the boundary, closer to us and, hence, overbearing and oppressive.*

## **5 Assessment of the planning issues**

The main planning considerations are:

- Design and impact to character and appearance of the site and surrounding area including heritage assets
- Neighbour amenity
- Highway safety and parking provision

### **a) Design and impact on the character and appearance of the site and surrounding area including heritage assets**

As detailed in Section 1 above, the application site is in a Special Character Area and in proximity to a Locally Listed Building. Therefore, special consideration has to be given to the impact of the proposal upon the character and appearance of the surrounding area and the setting of designated heritage assets which is afforded considerable weight under the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework (2021) and the Local Plan.

In light of the above, Officers have consulted the Council's Conservation Officer who has not raised an objection on heritage grounds.

At present, the existing dwelling is of largely one and half storey proportions, albeit it takes the appearance of a single storey dwelling owing to the limited first floor openings. The proposal would retain much of this appearance save for the first-floor extension to the eastern portion of the dwelling and the rear first floor windows which would be more of a two-storey appearance.

Due to the location of the application site set back from First Drift and the siting of the existing dwelling some 69m from the public footway at the top of a private access, passers-by on First Drift only benefit from a passing glimpse of the principal façade of the host dwelling. In addition, the main alterations to the roof height would be sited along the east elevation, away from public view afforded looking up the access path as well.

The infilling of the existing gap between the host dwelling and the existing garage, in combination with the proposed alteration to the garage roof, would create the most significant addition in terms of additional mass and volume resulting from the proposed scheme. However, Officers note that the proposed scheme would not result in the two-storey height development coming further forward than the rear wall of the existing garage. In addition, the comments of the Conservation Officer, that to an extent the proposal would harm the setting of Terracotta House, are noted. However, Officers consider that the overall two storey projection is considered to be of a size and scale which is not unduly dominant and in a position such that the separation to and setting of Terracotta House, the Locally Listed Building, as well as on the wider streetscene would be to a minimum and not of an adverse level to justify a refusal. This is also the conclusion of the Conservation Officer who has not raised objection overall.

With regards to the first-floor extension to the eastern flank of the dwelling, it is noted that this would raise the existing roof eaves from 3.6m to 7m and insert fenestration at first-floor level. The total height of the dwelling remains at 7.8m as existing.

The existing footprint of the dwelling would not be further extended out by the proposal and the outer limits of the built form on the site would be retained as existing, with the main volume and mass being created from within the mezzanine level and extending up above the existing eaves and the infill space between the dwelling and the garage as discussed above. This would therefore retain the proportions of the built development within the plot, prevent it appearing cramped or overdeveloped. Furthermore, the proposed external finishing materials would be such

the scheme would be amalgamated into the massing of the host dwelling without resulting in a visually jarring or incongruous appearance.

Taking the above into account, as a whole, it is considered that the proposal would not be out of keeping, disrespectful or disproportionate in scale, massing, and spacing in comparison to established properties such that the proposal would compromise the existing character or appearance of the Special Character Area. Whilst the concerns of the objectors and Parish Council are noted, Officers consider that the overall design approach is appropriate such that no unacceptable harm to the character, appearance or visual amenity of the area would result. The proposal would therefore be in accordance with the Wothorpe-specific policies of the Peterborough Design and Development in Selected Villages SPD (2011) and Policies LP16 and LP20 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019).

## **b) Neighbour amenity**

Three letters of representation were received from three neighbouring residents to the application site. The impact upon the amenity of each shall be addressed in turn.

### Terracotta House

The application site gradually slopes up from the driveway access adjacent to the footway edge and the level of Terracotta House, with a maximum elevation change of 2m up to the southwest end of the rear garden within the curtilage. As such, the application property has a greater impact than if the ground level were flat. Nevertheless, Officers note that the dwellinghouse is levelled into the ground at a lower elevation than the rear garden and the proposed first floor level would not contain any new openings on its north elevation facing Terracotta House. Therefore, the proposal would not result in any increased overlooking into the rear garden of Terracotta House or loss of privacy to primary habitable rooms.

In addition, Terracotta House is sited close to the footway edge along First Drift whilst the application site is sited further south with a separation distance of no less than 45m between the two dwellings. Considering this separation distance, orientation and siting, Officers deem that the proposal would not result in overbearing or overshadowing impact to this northward neighbour. Whilst some impact may be felt by the presence of the front extension and garage roof alteration within the garden of this neighbour, it is not considered that the proposal would be unduly dominant, obtrusive or overbearing.

### Tarrant's

This is the adjacent plot east of the application site and consists of a dwellinghouse sited north of the plot, close to the public footway and a long rear garden which stretches back to abut the application site on its east. There is an existing outdoor seating area and a summerhouse located approximately 30m north of the proposed development, with a minimum of 40m between the two dwellings. Officers note that the proposed scheme, due to the addition of the first-floor level and the raised height of the eaves along the east elevation close to the shared boundary, would result in the highest level of impact to this neighbour.

The east elevation of the proposed scheme of the main dwellinghouse would be partially screened from the rear seating and main outdoor amenity area by the existing trees which separate the rear section of the garden. In addition, although the first-floor extension would be sited closer to the boundary than any existing development, the maximum height and highest apex of the existing dwelling would remain as existing. Therefore, Officers acknowledge that there would be a degree of increased overbearing and visual impact to this adjacent neighbour resulting from the proposal. However, considering the separation distance and the benefit of a level of visual screening, on balance, the level of overbearing impact would not be of an unacceptable level of harm to justify a reason for refusal.

With regards to overlooking potential, the proposed development would contain habitable spaces at first-floor level. However, the windows located on the east elevation would be at a high level and serving secondary spaces such as bathrooms apart from Bedroom 2. As this high-level window serving Bedroom 2 would not be the main window, the use of obscure glazing could be secured without undue detriment to future occupier amenity. Accordingly, Officers recommend the use of a condition to secure obscure glazed and non-opening below 1.7m from finished floor level of the 4nos. windows proposed on the east elevation at first floor level in order to secure the privacy of the eastward neighbours.

Considering the siting and orientation, the proposed development would result in a minor level of overshadowing to the rear garden of Tarrants. However, as the plots are oriented northwest to southeast, the level of overshadowing would not be of an extent to result in unacceptable level of adverse harm to neighbour amenity.

### Friarfield

The dwellinghouse at Friarfield located to the south-east of Jubilee House and its garden, comprises of a tennis court, a swimming pool and paddock area.

Officers note that neither the proposed development nor the first-floor level windows would be sited closer to this eastward neighbour than the existing dwelling owing to the proposed scheme retaining the existing footprint on its east and south side. The proposed eastward windows would be at a higher level and obscure glazed by condition in the event of the approval of this application, thereby ensuring that there would not be an increased level of overlooking towards this neighbouring dwellinghouse from this element of the proposal.

Officers also note that the proposal includes new first floor windows and an enlargement to an existing first floor window on the southern elevation which may give rise to additional views towards this neighbour. The south elevation does not directly face the dwellinghouse at Friarfield and it would not, in the view of Officers, be reasonable to expect complete privacy for a tennis court. The existing swimming pool would be sited further east of the tennis court and benefits from hedging surrounding the pool deck as well as existing trees and greenery along the northward boundary between Friarfield and Tarrants. The separation distance would be some 43m to this swimming pool, and 60m window-to-window between the dwellings, at an oblique angle. This is considered sufficient to prevent undue loss of privacy.

Furthermore, it should be noted that the introduction of clear glazed first floor windows within the rear elevation of the existing dwellinghouse could be achieved without the need for planning permission, and this would result in a similar degree of impact in terms of overlooking. This is a material consideration and Officers do not consider it would be reasonable to sustain a reason for refusal on this basis.

### Arkengarth and St Martin's Cottage

Dwellings sited west and north-west of the application site also benefit from similar separation distance and a level of visual screening from existing trees whilst the west elevation closest to the westward boundary would not consist of new windows at first-floor level, thereby retaining similar levels of privacy as existing fall-back position. In addition, due to the existing plot widths and separation distances, the proposal would not result in overbearing or overshadowing impact of the neighbouring dwellinghouses sited west and north west.

Given the above, it is considered that on balance the proposed development would retain an acceptable level of neighbour amenity and would be in compliance with Policy LP17 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019).

### c) Highway safety and parking provision

The proposed development would result in a net gain of one bedroom. However, the existing double garage and front driveway would be retained for the provision of car parking which would meet the Council's minimum parking standard for dwellings with up to six bedrooms. In addition, the proposed scheme would not obstruct or impact on the access path and turning area in front of the dwellinghouse, thereby ensuring highway safety would be retained to existing and acceptable levels.

Given the above, the proposed development would be in accordance with Policy LP13 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019).

### d) Other matters raised

*- Impact to unconstructed, but permitted, garage serving Terracotta House and adequacy of site access and privacy to construction vehicles along shared access drive*

The proposed development would not conflict with the garage permitted for Terracotta House. It would be a civil matter to be resolved between the two neighbours in terms of site access, especially with regards to the existing driveway access being used for construction vehicles.

*- Impact to views and vistas*

Within planning, there is no 'right to a view' and this is not a material planning consideration. The impact of the proposal upon the character and appearance of the area has been fully considered above.

*- Incorrect visuals within the Design and Access Statement*

In the event of the proposal being accepted, the approval would be based on the submitted plans, and the graphic visuals of the Design and Access Statement would not take precedence. As such, it is a standard condition attached to planning approvals that the approved development would be in accordance with the relevant plans as referenced within the condition.

## 6 Conclusions

Subject to the imposition of the attached conditions, the proposal is acceptable having been assessed in the light of all material considerations, including weighing against relevant policies of the development plan and specifically:

- The proposal would not unacceptably impact upon the character and appearance of the site and the surrounding area, including the setting of a Locally Listed Building and Special Character Area, in accordance with Policies LP16 and LP20 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019) and the Peterborough Design and Development in Selected Villages SPD (2011).

- Neighbours surrounding the application site would retain an acceptable standard of amenity, in accordance with Policy LP17 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019).

- Parking provision and the safety of the surrounding highways would be retained to acceptable levels, in accordance with Policy LP13 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019).

## 7 Recommendation

The case officer recommends that Planning Permission is **GRANTED** subject to the following conditions:

C 1 The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.



Reason: In accordance with Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).

C 2 The development hereby permitted shall be implemented wholly in accordance with the following drawings:

- Site Location & Site Plan (Drawing no: A100/ rev B)
- Existing Plans (Drawing no: A101)
- Elevations - Existing (Drawing no: A300)
- Proposed Ground Floor Plan (drawing no: A102/ rev C)
- Proposed First Floor and Lower Ground Plan (Drawing no: A103/rev C)
- Elevations - Proposed (Drawing no: A301/ rev D)

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

C 3 Prior to their use, details of all external facing materials to be used shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In order to preserve the special architectural and historic character of the Locally Listed Building and Special Character Area, in accordance with Policies LP16 and LP20 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019) and the Peterborough Design and Development in Selected Villages SPD (2011).

C 4 Before the development hereby permitted is first occupied, the 4nos. first-floor level windows on the eastern side elevation serving the 'Ensuite' to Bed 1, 'Bed 2', 'Ensuite' to Bed 2, and 'Ensuite' to Bed 3 (as shown on Drawing Number A103/ rev B), shall be fitted with obscure glazing to a minimum of Pilkington Level 3 and be non-opening unless the parts of the window which can be opened are more than 1.7 metres above the floor of the room in which the window is installed. The obscure glazing shall be continuous and shall not incorporate any clear glazing features. The windows shall subsequently be retained as such in perpetuity.

Reason: In order to protect the amenities of neighbouring occupants, in accordance with Policy LP17 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019).

Copies to: Cllr David Over

This page is intentionally left blank