



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 June 2021

by C Beeby BA (Hons) MIPROW

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22nd June 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/J0540/D/21/3270580

29 King Henry Chase, Bretton, Peterborough, Cambs PE3 9XE

- 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 and Mrs F Giraldi against the decision of Peterborough City Council.
 - The application Ref 20/01667/HHFUL, dated 9 December 2020, was refused by notice dated 4 February 2021.
 - The development proposed is an extension (single storey).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for an extension (single storey) at 29 King Henry Chase, Bretton, Peterborough, Cambs PE3 9XE, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 20/01667/HHFUL dated 9 December 2020, 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: 3514-4 (Revision A), 3514-5 (Revision A), 3514-1 (Revision A), 3514-2 (Revision A).
 - 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 building.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The host dwelling is a detached property with a corner plot position on a residential street. The immediately surrounding area has a relatively built-up and enclosed appearance due to the presence of boundary walls and terraced or link detached housing.
4. The dwelling and its rear garage lie side-on to the street and are separated by a length of wall which adjoins the footway. The gap between development above the wall contributes some spaciousness to the street scene. Nevertheless, the view through the gap largely contains dwellings, so that it continues the built-up appearance of the street.

5. The proposed extension would be constructed between the house and garage, and its roof would consequently be visible above the wall from the street. The roof's slope towards the street and the inclusion of rooflights would allow for variation in the resulting building line which would prevent an overly oppressive and blank appearance.
6. The subservient scale of the proposal to the existing surrounding development would allow for the retention of a gap above the new extension which would retain a characteristic level of openness within views from the street and from nearby properties.
7. Furthermore, the host dwelling has surrounding spacious areas which result from its detached design and corner plot location, including those to the front of the property and in front of its garage. These contribute positively to the appearance of the street scene and would allow for the retention of a spacious appearance around the property if the proposal were constructed.
8. As a result of the above factors the scheme would avoid undue prominence within the street scene, and would retain an appearance of space between the existing dwelling and garage.
9. Thus, the proposal would have an acceptable effect on the character and appearance of the area. The scheme consequently complies with Policy LP16 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019) (the PLP), which requires development proposals to positively contribute to the character and local distinctiveness of the area.

Conditions

10. I have imposed a condition specifying the approved plans because it creates certainty for all parties.
11. A condition in respect of materials is necessary in order to protect the character and appearance of the area, in accordance with the design provisions of Policy LP16 of the PLP.
12. I have not imposed a condition requested by the Council which would have removed certain permitted development rights associated with the dwelling. I am mindful of advice in the National Planning Policy Framework (2019) and the Planning Practice Guidance and I consider that the evidence does not demonstrate why removing such rights is necessary.

Conclusion

13. There are no material considerations that indicate that the application should be determined other than in accordance with the development plan. For the reasons given above, I therefore conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

C Beeby

INSPECTOR