
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 December 2019

by J Williamson BSc (Hons) MPlan MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13 January 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/J0540/W/19/3230422

24 Peakirk Road, Glington, PE6 7LT

- 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 James Siggee against the decision of Peterborough City Council.
 - The application Ref 18/02188/FUL, dated 20 December 2018, was refused by notice dated 7 March 2019.
 - The development proposed is demolition of existing single-storey dwelling, erection of 3 single-storey dwellings.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The appellant has submitted a revised layout plan with the appeal, Ref 3046 PA001a. Although the appellant sought to submit this during the application process, it is not one of the plans the Council made its decision on. The revised layout plan seeks to address concerns raised by the Council in respect of the reasons for refusal relating to the width of the access and the location of bin stores. The Council has confirmed that the amended plan would overcome these concerns. I am satisfied that no parties would be prejudiced by accepting the revised layout plan, and I have therefore determined the appeal on this basis.
3. Since the appeal was submitted the Council has adopted a new Local Plan – the Peterborough Local Plan 2016 to 2036 (July 2019) (PLP). The Council has confirmed which new policies correspond with and replace the policies which the application was determined against. Parties have been given the opportunity to comment on the implications of the new Local Plan to the appeal. In accordance with planning law, I have determined the appeal based on the current development plan.

Application for costs

4. An application for costs was made by Mr James Siggee against Peterborough City Council. This application is the subject of a separate decision.

Main Issues

5. In light of the above, the main issues are:

- the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area, with particular regard to the surrounding pattern of development and the proposed layout, including frontage parking, and
- the effect of the proposed development on the living conditions of the occupiers of the neighbouring property, No 22a Peakirk Road, in respect of outlook and light.

Reasons

Character and appearance

6. The site consists of a detached, single-storey bungalow, domestic outbuilding and associated domestic curtilage. It is located towards the eastern edge of the built-up area of the village of Ginton, on the southern side of Peakirk Road, with development on Clarendon Way to the rear. The land directly opposite is open countryside, and I consider that the properties between Clarendon Way and the countryside serve as a transition between the open countryside and denser built environment.
7. The character of development on the southern side of Peakirk Road, between Clarendon way and the countryside, is mainly of detached dwellings, most of which are single-storey or dormer bungalows. These plots have relatively deep rear gardens. The gaps between the properties tend to be wider than the gaps between the dwellings to the rear of the site on Clarendon Way, and the first 10 or so properties west of the appeal site on the northern side of Peakirk Road. The 10 or so properties referred to on the northern side of Peakirk Road consist of a mix of single, one-and-a-half and two-storey detached dwellings.
8. I consider that sub-dividing the site to accommodate 3 separate dwellings, particularly with one at the rear of the site, would erode the transition between the open countryside and the built-up area. The deep rear garden would be substantially developed and the spaces between the 2 proposed dwellings at the front of the site and the existing neighbouring properties would be relatively narrow. I acknowledge that the Council's policies do not specify distance standards between properties or standards for outdoor space. However, the circumstances of the site provide the context within which to judge whether the character and appearance of an area are retained or harmed as a result of the proposed development.
9. The extent of hard standing at the front of the neighbouring properties varies, though most have more hard than soft landscaping. There is also a fairly-deep grass verge between the pavement and the front boundaries of the properties. As such, I consider the extent of the proposed hard standing to be used as frontage parking would reflect the character and appearance of the area. However, for the reasons outlined, I conclude that the proposed layout would have a harmful effect on the pattern of development within the transition between the countryside and the denser built up area. Consequently, the development would result in harm to the character and appearance of the area.
10. Collectively, Policy LP16 of the PLP and paragraph 127 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), require development proposals to be sympathetic to local character and/or positively contribute to it. Proposals should respect and respond appropriately to local patterns of development, including street plots and spaces between buildings. The Design and

Development in Selected Villages Supplementary Planning Document (2011) (SPD) acknowledges that new buildings in Ginton are likely to be sited on infill plots or be small developments. The SPD advises that such buildings should, among other things, be in keeping with the village environment. For the reasons outlined, the development would not accord with the policy and guidance referred to.

Living conditions – existing occupants

11. The existing bungalow is broadly in line with the front and rear elevations of No 22a. A detached outbuilding is sited to the rear of the property, adjacent to the boundary with No 22a. This outbuilding would be demolished. Although the proposal would result in the dwelling on plot 1 being slightly closer to the boundary with No 22a than the existing dwelling, it would be in a similar position it, and the existing dwelling is already close to the side elevation of No 22a. There are a few relatively small windows on the side elevation of No 22a that face the site. I observed that one is obscure-glazed. I have not been provided with any written evidence that the windows on the side of No 22a either serve habitable rooms or are the primary windows to habitable rooms. Bearing these factors in mind, the proposed dwelling on plot 1 would not result in an overbearing impact or material loss of light for the existing occupants of No 22a.
12. Therefore, I conclude that the proposal would not cause material harm to the living conditions of occupiers of 22a Peakirk Road in respect of outlook and light. As such, it would accord with Policy LP17 of the PLP, which seeks to ensure that new development does not have any unacceptable impact on the living conditions of existing occupiers of neighbouring properties.

Other Matters

13. The appellant refers to other considerations in support of the proposal. Thus, the Framework requires Councils to boost the supply of housing, which should include housing for all sections of society. The proposal would provide 2 additional dwellings that could meet the particular needs of a young family or elderly household. It would also use land efficiently. The site is not within the Ginton Conservation Area. The sizes of the proposed dwellings are in keeping with neighbouring properties. I note that room sizes exceed the Nationally Prescribed Space Standards and there are no local standards for outdoor space. The materials to be used would be in keeping with the area. All these considerations weigh in favour of the proposal.

Conclusion

14. While I have found that the proposal would not result in harm to the living conditions of occupants and other matters weigh in favour of the proposal, these are not sufficient to outweigh the harmful effect the works would have on the character and appearance of the area. As that results in conflict with development plan policies, I conclude that the proposal would be contrary to the development plan as a whole. As such, I conclude the appeal is dismissed.

J Williamson
INSPECTOR