

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 June 2020

by R Norman BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23 June 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/J0540/D/20/3249938

15 Eye Road, Dogthorpe, Peterborough PE1 4SA

- 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 J Blay against the decision of Peterborough City Council.
 - The application Ref 20/00094/HHFUL, dated 20 January 2020, was refused by notice dated 16 March 2020.
 - The development proposed is a loft conversion and first floor extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the development on:
 - the character and appearance of the area; and
 - the living conditions of neighbouring residents.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

3. The appeal site is located on Eye Road and is a single storey dwelling with associated garden land and driveway. The immediate area comprises residential properties, which include single storey and two storey dwellings with varied designs. The dwellings along the same side of the road as the appeal site are predominantly set back from Eye Road with extensive frontages and long rear gardens. The proposed development would involve the conversion of the existing loft and would also introduce an extension at first floor level.
4. The extension would result in the raising of the existing ridge which would be visible from the front of the property. However, the increase in roof height would not be visually unacceptable as it would follow the existing pitch. Furthermore, the existing property is set back a substantial distance from the road. Although the land levels rise upwards from the road the set back and boundary hedging would also mitigate any visual impact of the proposed height increase from the public realm.
5. The proposed first floor extension would form an L shape to the rear of the property. The extension would result in a stepped roof height and a double gable feature to the rear. The existing property is relatively simple in design and the proposed extension would be more detailed in its overall appearance.

However, the overall design would not be unduly incongruous, and the stepped arrangement would reduce the overall bulk and scale. Furthermore, the appeal site benefits from a long rear garden and therefore the proposed extension would not be over dominant within the site.

6. I note that in the surrounding area there are a number of examples of large dormers and some relatively large extensions that are visible from the road. Whilst the dormer extensions do not replicate the proposed extension they nevertheless result in some variation to the character and appearance of the area and dilute any uniformity along this part of the road. Accordingly, the proposed alterations would not be out of character or incongruous with the immediate surroundings.
7. Consequently, I find that the proposed extension would not be harmful to the character and appearance of the appeal site or the surrounding area. It would therefore comply with Policy LP16 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019) (Local Plan) insofar as it requires development to respect the context of the site and surrounding area and respond to the building form and views into and out of the site.

Living Conditions

8. The appeal property is set between two existing dwellings. The main part of the extension would be located adjacent to No 17 which is sited close to the side boundary with the appeal site. No 17 has windows and a door at ground floor level to the side and rear elevations which are partially visible above the close boarded fence. These windows are already in proximity to the existing property and fence and therefore I find that there would not be an undue level of additional harm arising from the proposed extension in relation to the ground floor.
9. However, No 17 has a large first floor dormer which has three windows directly facing the appeal property. Two of these windows are clear glazed and appear to serve habitable rooms. The proposed extension, due to its overall height and projection would result in a dominant and enclosing structure in relation to the outlook from these windows. I acknowledge that the proposal would not include first floor windows in the side elevation which would not therefore result in any issues of overlooking or loss of privacy. However, this would not mitigate the impact from the overall scale of this side of the proposed extension on the outlook from these particular windows.
10. Accordingly, for the above reason, the proposed development would harm the living conditions of the occupiers of No 17 as a result of the proximity of the extension to the first floor side windows of this property. The proposal would therefore fail to comply with Policy LP17 of the Local Plan which seeks to ensure that new development does not result in an unacceptable impact on the amenity of existing occupiers of any nearby properties including through an overbearing impact, amongst other things.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above, and having carefully considered all matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

R Norman INSPECTOR