The Planning Inspectorate

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: 30 June 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/J0540/W/20/3248585
25 Fairfield Road, Fletton, Peterborough, Cambs PE2 8BD

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant consent, agreement or approval to details required by a condition of a planning permission.
- The appeal is made by Mr Giuseppe Iantosca against the decision of Peterborough City Council.
- The application Ref 19/01416/DISCHG, dated 9 September 2019, sought approval of details pursuant to condition No 3 of a planning permission Ref 19/00534/FUL, granted on 6 April 2019.
- The application was refused by notice dated 28 November 2019.
- The development proposed is demolition of existing bungalow and construction of new two storey dwelling with garage.
- The details for which approval is sought are: external materials for the walling (brickwork).

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed and approval of the condition is refused, namely: the brick details submitted in pursuance of condition 3 attached to planning permission 19/01415/DISCHG.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is whether the specified brick type would reflect the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is located on a residential street, Fairfield Road. There is a planning permission for a replacement dwelling, under 19/00534/FUL, and the new dwelling appears to be under construction. This permission included a number of conditions and No 3, to which this appeal relates, requires the submission of details of the external materials for the walls, roof, windows and doors, garage doors, cills and lintels, driveway and path surfacing and rainwater goods. The submission relates only to the bricks.

4. The bricks that have been proposed are Old Windsor 65mm bricks. The Council have indicated that the proposed brick would be suitable for the side and rear elevations of the replacement dwelling but would not be acceptable for the front elevation.

5. The surrounding area hosts a variety of dwelling designs, however in terms of the existing bricks in the surroundings these are fairly uniform in appearance

and texture, being a reasonably smooth brick with a red to orange colour palate, despite their age and weathering. The proposed Old Windsor brick, although of an overall red/brown appearance, demonstrates a greater variety in colour than the prevailing materials used in the area. Coupled with the rougher texture of the proposed bricks this results in an appearance that would not sufficiently reflect the existing surroundings.

6. I have had regard to the other examples of similar bricks in the vicinity however I note that these are not all located on Fairfield Road and therefore are not directly comparable to the appeal site. Furthermore, the examples given do not significantly alter the predominant character and appearance of the surroundings.

7. I note that the Council have stated that the rendering of the front elevation would be acceptable, and I have little before me that would lead me to a different conclusion on this matter. However, the proposed rendering is not before me and as such I have considered this appeal on the basis of the bricks proposed. It would be for the Appellant to reapply to the Council with details of the rendering.

8. For the above reasons, I find that on the basis of the information before me, the use of the Old Windsor bricks would not reflect the existing character and appearance of the surrounding area and would therefore result in a development that would appear incongruous within the immediate street scene and be visually harmful in relation to the front elevation.

Conclusion

9. For the above reasons, and having had regard to all matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

R Norman

INSPECTOR