



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 August 2017

**by R A Exton Dip URP MRTPI**

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

**Decision date: 4<sup>th</sup> September 2017**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/J0540/D/17/3175663**

**2 Stonebridge Lea, Orton, Peterborough PE2 5LY**

- 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 Vernon-Richardson against the decision of Peterborough City Council.
  - The application Ref 17/00275/HHFUL, dated 1 February 2017, was refused by notice dated 20 April 2017.
  - The development proposed is described as replace existing side single storey roof with loft trusses to create office space and work area.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Main Issue

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

### Reasons

#### *Character and appearance*

3. The appeal site forms one half of a pair of semi-detached dwellings situated within a modern housing estate. Surrounding dwellings utilise similar designs and have very similar external materials. In particular, where dwellings are of two storeys, or have two storey elements, they display ground and first floor windows under a pitched roof. Overall, whilst there is variation in the appearance of individual dwellings, there is a strong degree of uniformity in the character and appearance across the area.
4. The proposal seeks to raise the roof height over an existing single storey side extension to provide additional first floor accommodation. This would maintain the single storey eaves height but raise the height of the roof by introducing a steeper pitch. The resulting ridgeline would exceed the height of the eaves on the two storey element of the host dwelling.
5. When viewed from Stonebridge Lea, the proposal would present a much steeper roof pitch and consequently much greater expanse of roof tiles than is evident on the host dwelling, its connected neighbour or within the surrounding area. As a result it would appear as an awkward addition that would be out of character with the host dwelling and surrounding area. The effect would be

emphasised by the proposals junction with the host dwelling where it would cut through the first floor eaves level.

6. I note the appellant's comparison with the roofs of other properties in the area. From the photographs submitted and my observations on site I consider that none are directly comparable to the appeal proposal and form a precedent that outweighs the harm I have identified.
7. In light of the above I conclude that the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area. Consequently, it would conflict with Policy CS16 of the Peterborough Core Strategy Development Plan Document adopted 2011 and Policy PP2 of the Peterborough Planning Policies Development Plan Document adopted 2012. These require development proposals to demonstrate high quality design that responds to local character.

*Other matters*

8. I note the appellant's comments on the Council's handling of the planning application however this is not a matter that forms part of this appeal. I also note the appellant's comments on the lack of objection to the proposal and the possible effects of an alternative design. However, I have considered this appeal on its individual merits based on the policies and evidence before me and these factors do not lead me to a different conclusion.

**Conclusion**

9. For the above reasons and taking all other matters raised into account, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

*Richard Exton*

INSPECTOR