

Application Ref: 24/00025/HHFUL

Proposal: Single storey rear extension as a disabled bedroom and wet room - retrospective

Site: 140 Northfield Road, Millfield, Peterborough, PE1 3QE

Applicant: Mr M Ali

Agent: Mr Iqbal, M.A.Iqbal Architecture

Site visit: 01.02.2024

Referred By: Cllr Khan

Reason for Call-in: The reason why they have built this is they have an autistic child and requires their own space. This is recommended and supported by letter from the doctor.

Case officer: Rio Howlett

Telephone No. 07551042164

E-Mail: Rio.Howlett@Peterborough.gov.uk

Recommendation: **REFUSE**

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

Site and Surroundings

The application site is located in Millfield in a predominantly residential area. The surrounding dwellings are of similar architectural style, most are two storey semi- detached constructed of red brick. The site itself is part of a two storey semi-detached pair, constructed of cream render, brown interlocking roof tiles and brown UPVC windows and doors.

The application site has two existing extensions to the rear of the property. The first was approved in 1998. The second extension has no planning permission; however, it is noted there is a 2002 permission for a conservatory (retrospective). The application site also houses an outbuilding to the rear of the garden, due to the size and scale of this development it would require planning permission. The exterior of the host dwelling has been rendered cream and appears to have been externally insulated, planning permission has not been applied for, but would have been required. With the exception of the 1998 extension the application site hosts a number of unauthorized structures and alterations. This application does not seek to regularise these structures and alterations within this application.

Proposal

Permission is sought for the erection of a single storey rear extension, to be constructed using matching materials to the existing dwelling (Retrospective). The proposal is 4.4m in depth 5.8m in width and 2.8m in height.

Note

An application was submitted in 2023 for a single storey rear extension of the same size and scale, and for the same use which was refused on design grounds under planning application 23/01312/HHFUL.

During the course of this application further information was requested from the Agent, however, no further details or justification was provided as to why the need cannot be accommodated in the existing dwelling or annex. As such there is no material difference in the current application from the previous application which was refused by Officers under reference 23/01312/HHFUL.

2 Planning History

Reference	Proposal	Decision	Date
97/01315/FUL	Single storey rear extension (amended scheme)	Permitted	21/01/1998
00/00862/FUL	Detached garage/store	Refused	22/09/2000
02/01804/FUL	Conservatory at rear - Retrospective	Permitted	13/02/2003
23/01312/HHFUL	Single storey rear extension for use as a disabled bedroom and wetroom (retrospective)	Refused	25/10/2023

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)

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.

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.

4 Consultations/Representations

PCC Enforcement Team

No comments received.

Millfield & New England Residents Planning Sub Group

No comments received.

Victoria Park Residents Association

No comments received.

Local Residents/Interested Parties

Initial consultations: 6

Total number of responses: 0

Total number of objections: 0

Total number in support: 0

No comments.

5 Assessment of the planning issues

The main considerations are:

- Design and impact on the character and appearance of the site and surrounding area
- Amenity
- Highway safety

a) Design and Visual Impact

The proposal is not sympathetic to the design of the host dwelling due to its cumulative impact in consideration of the two existing extensions. The proposals add a further 4.4m in depth, amassing 15m of development on the rear elevation of the host dwellinghouse. The additional depth would result in a contrived appearance that does not follow local patterns of development and represents an overdevelopment of the site. In the wider context of the site there are few examples of extensions which exhibit the same scale of the application site. The size and scale of the development combined with the outbuilding at the rear of the garden exacerbates concerns of overdevelopment as the rear elevation of the proposal and the principal wall of the outbuilding sit only 3.7m apart. This again demonstrates how the proposal would not be respectful or respond appropriately to the local patterns of development by virtue of the proposed size and scale of development.

The proposed single storey rear extension is to be constructed using matching and new materials. the proposal is to be constructed using red brick which differs from the cream render however matches the existing extensions. Brown UPVC windows and doors to match existing and the roof is to be flat and constructed of fibreglass which differs from the existing tiled gable roof on both extensions. The stark juxtaposition between the gable roof and flat roof is out of character for the area. Extensions in the vicinity of the application site predominantly adorn gable roof or roofs which slope away from the host dwelling. The flat roof contributes to an awkward appearance therefore adversely affecting the visual amenity of the application site and the surrounding properties.

In light of the above, the proposal is considered not to be in accordance with Policies LP16 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019)

b) Amenity

It is not considered that the development as proposed would have a material adverse impact on residential amenity in terms of overlooking due to the proposal being of a single storey height. The proposal adds an additional 4.4m along the shared boundary with No.138 Northfield Road. However, there is sufficient fencing between the properties and therefore, it is not considered to have an unacceptable adverse overbearing or overshadowing impact.

Through Policy LP17, the council seek to ensure the standards of amenity are obtained for both current and future occupiers. The proposal facilitates the loss of 4.4m of private rear outdoor amenity space and leaves only 3.7m separation distance from the proposal and existing outbuilding. Whilst officers are mindful of the need of the extension for the current occupants this reduction would not leave adequate private amenity space for future occupiers of the house. Therefore, this would adversely impact the amenity of future occupiers to a detrimental extent.

As the proposal reduces the separation distance to the outbuilding officers raised concerns over the provision of natural light in the outdoor amenity space however it is considered the impact will not be significant enough to be considered adverse.

Taking the above into account on balance, the proposed development is not in accordance with Policy LP17 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019)

c) Highway safety

It is not considered that there is any adverse highway safety impact from the proposal, with the proposed construction not causing disruption to parking provisions, nor disrupting access.

In light of the above, the proposal is considered to be in accordance with Policy LP13 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019).

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**

- R 1 The proposed rear extension would decrease the private amenity space of the application site and leave little garden area for future occupiers, which would unacceptably impact their amenity. As such, it is not considered to be in accordance with LP17 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019).
- R 2 The proposed rear extension would create an overdevelopment of the application site and is deemed as out of character for the surrounding local pattern of development. As such, it is not considered to be in accordance with LP16 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019).

Copies to Councillors – Councillor Muhammad Asif
Councillor Arfan Khan
Councillor Mohammed Sabir

This page is intentionally left blank