
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 31 January 2017

by L Fleming BSc (Hons) MRTPI

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

Decision date: 07 February 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/J0540/W/16/3161236
1,371 Lincoln Road, Peterborough PE4 6LT

- 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 David Barker against the decision of Peterborough City Council.
 - The application Ref 16/00262/FUL, dated 11 February 2016, was refused by notice dated 5 May 2016.
 - The development proposed is a bungalow.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal proposal would involve the erection of a detached bungalow within the rear garden of No 1371 Lincoln Road. The proposed dwelling would face Salisbury Road which is mainly characterised by modern bungalows set in small plots giving the area a compact and relatively uniform character and appearance.
 4. However, the proposed dwelling would be positioned close to the entrance to Salisbury Road where thick hedging on both sides of the road, street trees, trees within gardens and a grass verge give this part of the area a pleasant, verdant and spacious character which provides visual relief to the more compact pattern of development deeper into Salisbury Road.
 5. Even though the proposed dwelling would be similar in appearance to the other dwellings nearby and positioned roughly in line with No 2 Salisbury Road, the proposal would introduce a significant bulk of development at the entrance to Salisbury Road. Thus, consistent with the Inspector's findings in appeal decision reference APP/J0540/A/14/2219825, I find the proposed development would erode the verdant and spacious quality of this part of the area which would be harmful to the overall character and appearance of the area.
 6. In reaching these conclusions I have considered what may be able to be built under the Town and Country Planning General Permitted Development (England) Order (2015). However, whilst I note the suggestion of a building of
-

a similar size to the dwelling proposed there is no substantive evidence before me which allows me to assess the impact of such a building or the likelihood of such a fall-back position being implemented should the appeal fail.

7. That said, I attach limited weight to the fall-back position and on balance, for the reasons given, I find the appeal proposal before me would fail to accord with the development plan. It would specifically be in conflict with Policy CS16 of the Peterborough Core Strategy Development Plan Document (2011) and Policy PP2 of the Peterborough Planning Policies Development Plan Document (2012) which taken together, aim to ensure new development responds appropriately to the particular character of the site and its surroundings and makes a positive contribution to the quality of the built environment.

Conclusion

8. For the reasons set out above and with regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

L Fleming

INSPECTOR