



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 31 January 2020

**by Chris Forrett BSc(Hons) DipTP MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 14<sup>th</sup> February 2020**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/J0540/D/19/3241740**

**120 Padholme Road, Peterborough PE1 5EN**

- 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 M Hussain against the decision of Peterborough City Council.
  - The application Ref 19/00881/HHFUL, dated 10 May 2019, was refused by notice dated 27 September 2019.
  - The development proposed is a two-storey side and rear and single storey rear extension.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a two storey side and first floor rear extension and a single storey rear extension at 120 Padholme Road, Peterborough PE1 5EN in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 19/00881/HHFUL, dated 10 May 2019, subject to the following conditions:
  - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
  - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Location Plan; Existing/Proposed Block Plan 001; Proposed floor plan 03; and Proposed Elevational Plan 04.
  - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing dwelling.

### Procedural Matter

2. The Council have described the proposal as a 'proposed two storey side and 1st floor rear extension and a single storey rear extension'. It is noted that the Appellant has also utilised this description on their appeal form. Given that this revised description accurately reflects the proposal before me, I have determined the appeal with the revised description in mind.

### Main Issue

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

### Reasons

4. The appeal site is located in a predominantly residential area of Peterborough where there is a mix of detached, semi-detached and terraced properties in the

- immediate vicinity of the site. The appeal property itself is a semi-detached dwelling. To the east of the appeal site is a detached property, 122 Padholme Road, which is a detailed inter-war building which has also been extended to the side facing Star Road.
5. The proposed two storey side extension would extend to the property boundary and would largely fill the gap between the appeal property and the building of No 122.
  6. However, there would still be a small gap between the respective properties and the proposed extension would be set back from the front main wall of the property giving it a degree of subserviency. As a result, it would not appear as an overly dominant or obtrusive extension to the host dwelling.
  7. Furthermore, it is also significant that opposite the site is a long run of terraced properties. To that end, I consider that the closing of the gap between the properties would not have any significant impact on the overall character of the street.
  8. Notwithstanding that, the Council consider that No 122 is of a unique design in the locality and is in a prominent position which contributes positively to the streetscene. The Council also consider that it is an interesting historical building.
  9. Whilst not specifically advanced by the Council, it could be considered that the building is a non-designated heritage asset. With that in mind, I am conscious of paragraph 197 of the National Planning Policy Framework which indicates that the effect of an application on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be taken into account in determining a planning application.
  10. In this case, No 122 is clearly an attractive building in a prominent corner position. However, its appearance and setting has already been compromised by the single storey side extension fronting Star Road and to a lesser extent the recently constructed dwelling to the rear of the property.
  11. In weighing up the effect of the development, in my view, No 122 would not lose its important characteristics which I consider is largely as a result of its corner position together with the design features on the original building. Therefore, I consider the proposal would not harm its historical significance.
  12. Finally, the Council have indicated that they have no objections to the extension works at the rear of the property and I have no reason to disagree with that view.
  13. For the above reasons the development would not harm the character and appearance of the area and would accord with Policy LP16 of the Peterborough Local Plan 2016-2036 which amongst other matters seeks to ensure that all development contributes positively to the character and local distinctiveness of the area including spaces between buildings.

### **Conditions**

14. Other than the standard time limit condition, it is necessary to ensure that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans for the

reason of certainty. In the interest of the character and appearance of the area a condition relating to the use of matching materials is also necessary.

**Conclusion**

15. Taking all matters into consideration, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

*Chris Forrett*

INSPECTOR