
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 November 2021

by David Troy BSc (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12 November 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/J0540/D/21/3277993

25 Upton Close, Stanground, Peterborough PE2 8LU

- 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 Sujan Budhathoki against the decision of Peterborough City Council.
 - The application Ref 21/00369/HHFUL, dated 11 March 2021, was refused by notice dated 6 May 2021.
 - The development proposed is loft conversion.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed front dormer extension on the character and appearance of the host property and the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a detached bungalow located on a corner plot in a mature well-established residential area. Upton Close is typically characterised by detached single storey properties of comparable scale and form with gabled roofs set back from the road behind a front garden/driveway. The proposal involves the construction of a flat roof dormer extension across the front of the property that would be inset from the edges and eaves of the roof and built up to the ridge line of the host property.
4. Although the proposed front dormer would be set in, the proposed roof addition would result in a material alteration to the property's gabled roof, which currently makes a positive contribution to the roofscape of the host property. The proposed roof alteration would result in additional bulk at the front of the main dwelling that would be very much at odds with the more modest form and appearance of the host building.
5. These shortcomings are exacerbated by the proposal's position, which would be visible from a number of public vantage points along Upton Close and Whittlesey Road. The proposed front dormer roof extension, by virtue of its scale, siting and design, would fail to achieve an appropriate degree of subordination to the host property and would detract from the architectural integrity of the host property. As such, I consider that the proposed dormer extension would result in an incongruous and out-of-keeping addition that would cause unacceptable harm to the host property and the area.

6. I have considered the appellant's arguments that the design and layout of the proposed dormer extension have been carefully considered in order to take into account the character of the host property and the other roof designs in the area. Whilst the use of matching materials, fenestrations and the well-established trees to the front of the site would assist in integrating the proposed extension with the host property and the area, these aspects again do not overcome the adverse effects outlined above.
7. Consequently, I conclude that the proposed development would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host property and the area. It would be contrary to Policy LP16 of the Peterborough Local Plan 2019. This policy, amongst other things, seeks to ensure that development proposals respect the context of the site and surrounding area in term of the building form, including size, scale, massing, details and materials and positively contribute to the character and local distinctiveness of the area.

Other Matters

8. I have noted the other developments in the area drawn to my attention by the appellant. However, the various roof extensions and alterations on the properties within the surrounding area have different development characteristics to the appeal scheme. In any event, each proposal falls to be assessed primarily on its own merits and I am unaware of the full circumstances associated with these other cases.
9. I note the appellant's comments regarding the context provided in the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) for innovative and good design and the opportunities to support the effective use of airspace above existing residential properties and to meet the needs of modern flexible home/working space, but I find that the development does not achieve the standards the Framework seeks.
10. I have considered the appellant's arguments regarding the type of extensions and roof alterations that can be erected on a dwellinghouse under General Permitted Development Rights. Whilst this may be so, this does not set a precedent for such an inappropriate development in this location for the reasons set out above.
11. The appellant considers the proposal would constitute a sustainable form of development in line with the requirements of the Framework. I have considered the various benefits put forward by the appellant that the proposal would bring, including providing additional accommodation to meet the applicant's needs and future occupants requirements, the effective use of land and buildings, contributing to the local economy through additional building work and increased Council tax receipts. While I have given them some weight, these modest benefits would not be sufficient to outweigh the harm I have identified. For all these reasons, there are no other material considerations to outweigh the development plan conflicts identified.
12. For the reasons given above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

David Troy

INSPECTOR