

10/01705/FUL PROPOSED TWO STOREY SIDE EXTENSION AND GROUND FLOOR REAR EXTENSION AT 90 VERE ROAD, PETERBOROUGH (PART RETROSPECTIVE)  
VALID: 22/12/2010  
APPLICANT: MISS S BIBBI  
AGENT: MR N P BRANSTON  
REFERRED BY: HEAD OF PLANNING SERVICES  
REASON: THE IMPACT CAUSED BY THE PROPOSAL ON THE AMENITY OF THE APPLICANT'S PROPERTY AND THAT OF NEIGHBOURING DWELLINGS AND UPON THE CHARACTER OF THE AREA  
DEPARTURE: NO  
CASE OFFICER: MR C J EDWARDS  
TELEPHONE: 01733 454443  
E-MAIL: chris.edwards@peterborough.gov.uk

---

---

## **1 SUMMARY/OUTLINE OF THE MAIN ISSUES**

The main considerations are:

- Size and scale of proposed rear single storey extension
- Loss of amenity space to host dwelling
- Impact on amenity on neighbouring dwelling
- Impact of proposal on character of the area

The Head of Planning, Transportation & Engineering Services recommends that the application is **REFUSED**.

## **2 PLANNING POLICY**

In order to comply with Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 decisions must be taken in accordance with the development plan policies set out below, unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

### **Development Plan Policies**

Relevant policies are listed below with the key policies highlighted.

#### **Peterborough Core Strategy Development Plan CS16 Urban Design and the Public Realm**

High quality and inclusive design will be required for all new developments as part of a strategy to achieve an attractive, safe, healthy, accessible and sustainable environment throughout Peterborough. Design solutions should take the following principles into account:

- New development should not result in unacceptable impact on the amenities of occupiers of any nearby properties.

### 3 DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL

This application has arisen as a result of unauthorised works being reported to the Planning Compliance (enforcement) team. Work has already started to construct the rear extension without obtaining either Planning Permission or Building Regulations approval.

Permission is hereby sought to construct two extensions to the property at 90 Vere Road, Peterborough.

Two storey side extension – This application seeks permission to erect a two storey extension to the side of the dwelling. This will result in the width of the dwelling being extended by approximately 2m and bring the end wall up to the boundary with the adjacent property. The purpose of this is to extend the third bedroom and create an additional room for use as a study on the first floor. The ground floor is to be left open to create a covered passageway to the rear.

Single storey rear extension – The application also seeks permission to erect a single storey extension to the rear of the dwelling. This proposed extension measures approximately 9m from the rear wall of the original dwelling and is to cover the entirety of its width. The purpose of this extension as stated on the plans is to create an enlarged kitchen measuring 23.5 sq metres and a new lounge with ensuite WC measuring a total of 31.9 sq metres. The proposal will also create an additional WC in place of the area currently occupied by the kitchen.

Subsequent communication with the applicant has revealed that the purpose of the rear extension is to be an annex for the applicant's disabled mother.

### 4 DESCRIPTION OF SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

Vere Road is a predominantly residential area built sometime around the 1930s. It features a wide road with the houses set back some way from it. Most properties have off-road parking and modest front garden space.

The house itself is a detached property and has an attractive and well maintained appearance. It is set between a row of semi-detached houses to the left and a short terrace to the right.

The house sits off-centre within its plot leaving approximately 2m space between the left hand gable wall and the property boundary. The neighbouring property is set another 2-3m within its plot leaving considerable separation between the two dwellings. On its right the house abuts the property boundary with a small 1m wide footpath separating it from the terraced houses.

The rear garden is approximately 18m x 8m and ends in a row of tall conifer trees. As noted above, at the time of visiting construction of the rear extension was already underway and so the intended scale of this extension was immediately apparent.

### 5 PLANNING HISTORY

| Ref             | Description                                                        | Status | Open Date  | Closed Date |
|-----------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------|--------|------------|-------------|
| 10/00040/CONTRA | Building Regulations Contravention                                 | SER    |            |             |
| 10/01705/FUL    | Proposed two storey side extension and ground floor rear extension | PDE    | 16.12.2010 |             |
| 10/00558/ENFEXT | Enforcement Enquiry                                                | PLNREC | 23.11.2010 |             |

## 6 CONSULTATIONS/REPRESENTATIONS

### LOCAL RESIDENTS

One letter of objection has been received from the Millfield and New England Regeneration Partnership (MANERP) raising objections on the basis that:

- The proposed extensions are an over development of the site, further that the proposed rear extension is likely to have a detrimental impact on the neighbouring properties.

### COUNCILLORS

Cllr Hussain was present at the site visit and spoke in support of the applicant's intention to care for her mother at this address.

## 7 REASONING

### **Background**

Whilst the Council seeks to support homeowners who wish to extend their homes, particularly for the purposes of the present case; such extensions should be proportional to the size of the original dwellinghouse and respect the amenity space of neighbouring properties.

In principle the proposed side extension is considered acceptable, subject to a number of minor design changes to the appearance of the front elevation that help to match it to the existing street scene.

The principle of extending the dwelling to the rear is also considered acceptable, however the size and scale of the proposed rear extension is not. Considerable effort has been made by both the planning office and agent to broker a suitable compromise on behalf of the applicant. Revised drawings were received which reduced the depth of the proposed rear extension by 2m and stepped the northern boundary wall in to mitigate the impact of the extension on the amenity of number 92 Vere Road.

Subsequent correspondence from the applicant however asked the Council to disregard the revised plans submitted and only consider those submitted as part of the original application. On this basis this application is recommended for refusal for the following reasons.

### **This development will result in an unacceptable impact on the amenities of occupiers of any nearby properties**

Whilst only single storey, the necessary height of the proposed rear extension will create overbearing encroachment into the amenity space of number 92 Vere Road owing to its overall scale and close proximity to the boundary. This will further be exacerbated by the fact that the extension will be located directly to the south of the rear garden of number 92, resulting in unacceptable overshadowing.

### **This development cannot be comfortably accommodated within the site**

The rear extension is unsatisfactorily large and cannot be adequately accommodated within the grounds of 90 Vere Road without having a detrimental impact on the amenity of the dwelling. Householder extensions should respect the scale of the host dwelling and the size of the plot in which it is situated.

The proposed extensions will more than double the footprint of the dwelling and result in almost 50% of the rear garden space being occupied by the building.

### **Impact on the character of the area**

The character of the surrounding area is that of a moderate density city suburb. The terracing effect of development in this area is broken up by the inclusion of adequate space between dwellings and proportionally sized garden space to the front and rear of each property.

### **Personal circumstances of the applicant do not outweigh the planning objections to this proposal**

This size of the rear extension being proposed as part of this application is being justified on the basis of the personal circumstances of the applicant. Generally speaking however, whilst personal circumstances can be a material planning and Human Rights consideration, in this circumstance they do not outweigh the provisions of the prevailing Development Plan for the reasons stated in the following paragraphs.

The applicant states that the size of the proposed extension is necessary for her mother's rehabilitation following a road traffic accident, notwithstanding this however, the supporting evidence provided by the applicant in respect of her mother's requirements, states only that regular exercise is required, and does not go so far as to rule out the possibility of alternatives such as either exercising outdoors or with the aid of exercise equipment. On this basis the supporting medical evidence does not justify such a large extension to this property.

Planning officers have suggested revisions to the scheme. The revisions would give rise to a rear extension larger than we would normally permit in recognition of the applicant's mother's needs, but have been rejected by the applicant.

## **8 CONCLUSIONS**

The extension to the side is considered acceptable subject to minor changes to its design. However, the size and scale of the proposed rear extension is considered unacceptable and will have an enormously detrimental impact on the amenity of the neighbouring property in terms of overshadowing and visual impact. Whilst precedent is not a reason to refuse the application, it must be noted that it is not normal practice for the Council to permit extensions of such a scale and indeed we have recently not accepted single storey extensions of a lesser scale in similar physical circumstances. It would be inconsistent to make an exception in this case. As it is not lawful for the Local Planning Authority to issue a split decision on a planning application, the whole proposal (ie side and rear extension) is recommended for refusal.

## **9 RECOMMENDATION**

This application is recommended for REFUSAL.

### **R1 Impact on amenity of neighbouring property**

The proposed rear extension will result in an overbearing encroachment into the amenity space of number 92 Vere Road owing to its overall scale and close proximity to the boundary. This will further be exacerbated by the fact that the extension will be located directly to the south of the rear garden of number 92, resulting in unacceptable overshadowing and visual impact. It is therefore considered that the impact on residential amenity of number 92 Vere Road is unacceptable and as such contrary to Policy CS16 of the Peterborough Core Strategy 2011 which relates to Urban Design and the Public Realm. This states that:

Design solutions should take the following principles into account:

- New development should not result in unacceptable impact on the amenities of occupiers of any nearby properties.

### **R2 Poor design and out of keeping with character of area**

The proposed single storey rear extension would by virtue of its scale and projection, appear unduly obtrusive, overbearing and out of character with the original property and would be to the detriment of the overall character and appearance of the area. This is contrary to Policy CS16 of the Peterborough Core Strategy 2011 which relates to Urban Design and the Public Realm. This states that:

Design solutions should take the following principles into account:

- New development should respond appropriately to the particular character of the site and its surroundings, using innovative design solutions where appropriate; make the most efficient use of land; enhance local distinctiveness through the size and arrangement of development plots, the position, orientation, proportion, scale and massing of buildings and the arrangement of spaces between them; and make use of appropriate materials and architectural features.

Copies to Councillors P Kreling, Y Lowndes, J Peach

This page is intentionally left blank