
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 October 2016

by John Morrison BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 7 November 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/D0515/D/16/3157113

34 Yarwells Headlands, Whittlesey, Peterborough PE7 1RF

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Rob Walker against the decision of Fenland District Council.
 - The application Ref F/YR16/0506/F, dated 16 June 2016, was refused by notice dated 19 August 2016.
 - The development proposed is a single storey extension to front of bungalow.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. At the time of my site visit, there was a partially built extension to the front of the appeal building. From the evidence before me, the extension appears to be the same siting, size and design as the proposed development. The description of development would therefore be better described as seeking part retrospective planning permission. I have determined the appeal on this basis.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal building is situated in a rectangular plot with a rear garden extending to the north. It is one of a number of other detached bungalows facing south towards the road in a distinct and designed staggered formation with a strong sense of spaciousness to their frontages. This uniformity is specific to the street scene as it is made up of the dwellings between Numbers 30 and 40 Yarwells Headlands inclusively.
 5. The proposed development would extend the appeal building forward of the principal elevation by a substantial degree and whilst it would share design and appearance characteristics with the appeal building, it would be highly noticeable. Within the uniformity of the street scene there is some minor variance in external detailing and examples of forward projection. However, these are modest in comparison to the proposed development and wholly different in scale, design and appearance terms.
-

6. In terms of the wider estate, there are a number of other extensions which in some cases are substantial and in visually prominent locations which have altered appearance to varying degrees. I also accept that neither the street scene nor the wider estate is of significant architectural or historic merit.
7. However, the street scene formed by the staggered and spacious siting and orientation of the buildings within it is a defining characteristic which is distinctive in itself. It is a designed element of the estate. Whilst it is in micro scale relative to the wider estate, it is not any less significant in how it contributes, positively in my view, to the character and appearance of the area.
8. By virtue of the siting and extent of projection of the proposed development therefore, harm would be caused to the character and appearance of the area and as such there would be conflict with Policy LP16 of the Fenland Local Plan 2014. This Policy seeks to ensure that, amongst other things and along with section 7 of the Framework¹, new development is of a high quality and contextually appropriate design and appearance and makes a positive contribution to the character and local distinctiveness of the area.

Other Matters

9. I note that no objections to the proposed development were received during the planning application or appeal processes from either local residents or statutory consultees. The lack of negative responses in this case does not however negate the statutory requirement to assess the effects of a given development to ensure that material planning harm is not caused and that it complies with the Development Plan.
10. The appellant makes reference to the initial request by the Council to reduce the projection of the originally submitted extension but that the proposed development in its entirety was then refused planning permission. The appellant cites this example to highlight inconsistencies in the Council's approach and infers that some form of extension may be acceptable. Whilst this may be the case, this is not the development before me which I have considered on its own individual merits.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons set out above, and having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is dismissed.

John Morrison

INSPECTOR

¹ The National Planning Policy Framework 2012