

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 January 2017

**by R W Allen B.Sc PGDip MRTPI**

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

**Decision date: 31 January 2017**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/J0540/W/16/3158118**

**34 Uffington Road, Barnack PE9 3DU**

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant outline planning permission.
  - The appeal is made by S Mead against the decision of Peterborough City Council.
  - The application Ref 16/01256/OUT, dated 13 June 2016, was refused by notice dated 31 August 2016.
  - The development proposed is new three bed detached house in rear garden.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Preliminary Matter

2. The appeal proposal is in outline form, with all matters reserved for subsequent approval. Any other details shown which would be a reserved matter, such as the layout, I shall treat as being indicative only.

### Main Issues

3. The main issues are:
  - The effect of the proposed development on highway safety; and
  - The effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

### Reasons

#### *Highway safety*

4. Little evidence is before me of how the proposed dwelling would be accessed, whether to the side of the existing dwelling or via the adjacent private driveway, and subsequently how the site would accommodate vehicle parking. I appreciate that matters relating to access is a reserved matter, and the specific safety details including visibility splays could be resolved at that stage. However, without sufficient evidence of access arrangements, I am unable to conclude with any degree of certainty whether the dwelling could be implemented in the first place, or what the likely the implications for the local highway network would be.
  5. Therefore I must find take a precautionary approach and find against the proposal on this matter. It would not accord with Core Strategy policy CS14 and Planning Policies policy PP12. These state that all new development should
-

demonstrate that appropriate and viable opportunities have been taken to reduce the environmental impacts of transport through mitigation and appropriate design, and that planning permission for development will only be granted if appropriate provision has been made for safe and convenient access and would not result in an unacceptable impact on highway safety.

### *Character and appearance*

6. The appeal site is the rearmost part of the garden of No 34 Uffington Road (No 34), which is a two-storey end of terraced property. The Council states that it lies inside but adjacent to the northern settlement edge of Barnack as defined in the Peterborough Core Strategy Development Plan Document 2011 (Core Strategy). Land to the north and east is open countryside. A modern development of houses lies on the opposite side of Uffington Road.
7. I observed and appreciated the original and linear form of residential development of the village. Nevertheless, development to the rear of neighbouring properties has already taken place. While the newer development is easily identifiable and distinguishable from those to the front, I nonetheless find that the newer dwellings now form an integral part Barnack's overall character, and that it has altered its original linear layout. Furthermore, the residential development opposite includes dwellings behind those fronting Uffington Road which directly face the open countryside, in a similar way as proposed scheme before me would do.
8. The proposed dwelling would not be readily visible when viewed from within village; and only glimpsed and short range views of the appeal site would be afforded when approaching from the north along Uffington Road owing to the existence of roadside planting. From here, and viewed in the context of those properties opposite, I do not find that the proposed development would appear noticeably at odds or out of place with the character of the village. As each proposal is considered on its own merits, I am satisfied that the proposed development would not axiomatically set a future precedent.
9. I therefore find that character and appearance of the village would not be significantly harmed as a result of the proposed development. It would accord with Core Strategy policy CS16 and with policy PP2 of the Peterborough Planning Policies Document (2012) (Planning Policies). These state that high quality and inclusive design will be required and that all new developments should respond appropriately to the particular character of the site and surroundings; and that planning permission will only be granted for development where the layout, design and appearance of the proposal would not have a detrimental effect on the character of any immediately adjoining properties or the surrounding area. It would also accord with the Council's Supplementary Planning Document entitled 'Design and Development in Selected Villages' for Barnack (and Pilsgate) which requires new development to reflect the character of the village and not be out of place.

### **Conclusion**

10. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

*R Allen*

INSPECTOR