

Application Ref: 24/00114/HHFUL

Proposal: Proposed front staircase extension and rear first floor bedroom extension.

Site: 33 Chisenhale, Orton Waterville, Peterborough, PE2 5FP

Applicant: Mr R Baldacci

Agent: Mr Mark Bennis
Paul Bancroft Architects

Referred By: Cllr Asim Mahmood

Reason for Referral: Cllr Mahmood believes the proposal accords with policies LP16 and LP17

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 site is located within a residential area in southwestern Peterborough (Orton). There are areas of woodland and amenity land surrounding the residential properties. Dwellings are predominantly large detached with large driveways. The properties are of similar architectural style with catslide roofs. The application site itself consists of a large, detached dwelling with parking to the front of the property. It is constructed using buff brick, wooden cladding, brown interlocking roof tiles and brown UPVC windows and doors. Additionally, the application site has solar panels on the southern roof elevation and external beams supporting the roof which are clearly visible from the street scene adding interest. The site abuts a buffer of trees where Oundle road sits just beyond.

Note

An application was submitted in November 2023 for a proposed front extension and a rear first floor extension of a similar size and scale under reference 23/01573/HHFUL

Proposal

Proposed front extension and rear first floor extension. The proposal would be of the same design and appearance as a previous application - 23/01573/HHFUL which was refused in November 2023 due to its adverse impact to the character of the dwelling and its surroundings, contrary to Policy LP16 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019). The only difference with the current proposal is that it reduces the height of the front extension by 0.3m.

2 Planning History

Reference	Proposal	Decision	Date
23/01573/HHFUL	Proposed front extension and rear first floor extension	Refused	16/01/2024
19/00047/HHFUL	Single storey first floor front extensions and two storey rear extension	Permitted	04/03/2019

3 Planning Policy

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

National Planning Policy Framework (2023)

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

Orton Waterville Parish Council

The Parish Council consider the scalability, appearance and design/architecture of this proposed development not to be in keeping with that of the existing buildings. Chisenhale has its own unique style which should be maintained. In particular timber external cladding finish and render to walls was not used for the original development.

Local Residents/Interested Parties

Initial consultations: 4

Total number of responses: 0

Total number of objections: 0

Total number in support: 0

No comments were received for this application.

5 Assessment of the planning issues

The main planning considerations are:

- Design and impact to local character
- Neighbour amenity
- Parking standards

A) Design and Visual Impact

It is noted that under 19/00047/HHFUL, permission has been previously granted for an extension on the principal elevation. This development is partially implemented and is due for completion in 2024. The first floor and rear first floor extension would be constructed using materials matching those use in the existing dwelling. The proposed extensions are to be completed using cedar cladding matching the 19/00047/HHFUL permission (Partially implemented). This cladding creates a sense of cohesion as it incorporates the design aspect seen on the principal elevation.

The proposed extension to the principal elevation will be visible from the public realm resulting in an additional front facing gable which would sit adjacent to the previous extension approved under 19/00047/HHFUL. When assessing the cumulative impact of the proposal and the extant permission (1900047/HHFUL), the extensions would no longer be subordinate to the host dwelling, the two projecting extensions to the principal elevation will add substantial massing, and it is noted that this design feature is not seen elsewhere within the distinctive architecture of Chisenhale. The proposal would not be read as sympathetic or ancillary to the host dwelling due to its size and scale, contrary to LP16 of the Peterborough Local plan as LP16 (a) of the Peterborough Local Plan which states that the design of applications must be respectful of its context including massing and scale of the proposal.

The proposal is not sympathetic to the design of the existing dwelling and would result in an awkward appearance within its surroundings. The surrounding area is characterised by a distinct architectural design, all two-storey dwellings feature a catslide roof, making it a prominent and unique characteristic of the area. The extant permission facilitated a partial loss of this feature, leaving a catslide roof with wooden beam features, completely removing this feature would not be respectful to the existing built form as it would detract from the local character and distinctiveness

of the area. Whilst the principal proposal has a 0.3m reduction in height from the 23/01573/HHFUL it would still see the loss of the catslide roof.

The Parish Council raised concerns about the proposed development stating that the proposal would not be respectful of the local patterns of development and the application site, and that the proposal would adversely affect the character of the site. Officers agree with the Parish Council and consider the proposal would result in an adverse level of impact on the site and surrounding area.

On Balance the proposal is contrary to Policy LP16 Of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019).

B) Neighbour Amenity

The application site is set 1.2M from the shared boundary on the Western side of the property, the rear extension is proposed over the existing footprint of the property and therefore will not encroach closer to this shared boundary. Whilst the rear extension does feature a first-floor window within bedroom 4 that sits 3.3M away from the western boundary, it is considered that No. 32a's rear extension serves as sufficient mitigation for the issues of overlooking, overbearing, or overshadowing upon their outdoor rear amenity space.

Although there is an increase of glazed area on the proposed principal elevation it is not considered to have adverse effects on neighbour amenity by means of overlooking as the property is set back from the road as is the adjacent dwelling. Due to the siting of the application site, it is not considered that the proposal on the principal elevation would adversely impact by way of overshadowing or overbearing.

In light of the above the proposal is in accordance with Policy LP17 of the Peterborough Local plan (2019).

C) Parking Standards

The proposal would not alter the current parking arrangements. There is sufficient parking on the driveway of the site in line with the parking standards set out in Appendix C of the Peterborough Local Plan.

As such, the proposal is considered to accord 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 Executive Director of Place and Economy recommends that Planning Permission is **REFUSED**

- R 1 The proposed extensions by virtue of its design, size, scale, and positioning would not be respectful to the local building forms and would not result in a subservient extension to the original dwellinghouse. The proposal would negatively impact upon the character of the site and surrounding area, detracting from the character of the original dwellinghouse and the wider street scene by virtue of the massing and scale of development. The development therefore causes unacceptable harm to the character, appearance and visual amenity of the site and surrounding area contrary to Policy LP16 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019).

Copies to Councillors – Councillor Nicola Day
Councillor Kirsty Knight
Councillor Julie Stevenson

This page is intentionally left blank