The Planning Inspectorate

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/21/3278334
14 Huntsmans Gate, Bretton, Peterborough PE3 9AU

- 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 Mrs Alpa Shah against the decision of Peterborough City Council.
- The application Ref 21/00188/HHFUL, dated 9 February 2021, was refused by notice dated 27 April 2021.
- The development proposed is first floor extension over existing garage.

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a first floor extension over existing garage at 14 Huntsmans Gate, Bretton, Peterborough PE3 9AU in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 21/00188/HHFUL, dated 9 February 2021, 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 approved plans: 2015-01 (Existing Plans), 2015-02 (Existing Elevations), 2015-03 (Proposed Plans), 2015-04 (Proposed Elevations).

   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 Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposed development on:

   (i) the character and appearance of the host property and the area, and

   (ii) the living conditions of the occupiers of the neighbouring property at No. 12 Huntsmans Gate with particular regard to overshadowing and outlook.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The appeal property is a two storey detached dwelling with a single storey integral double garage and two storey gable projecting from the front of the property. It is located in a mature well-established residential area characterised by detached properties of varied styles and design set back from

the road behind front gardens/driveways. A number of the dwellings have single and two storey front extensions of varying styles and designs that generally appear as clearly subordinate to the dwellings.

4. The appeal proposal would involve the construction of first floor extension over the integral garage that would project out by about 5.5m from the front of the property. The proposed extension would be set back from the public highway and stepped down below the ridge of the host property with a gabled tiled roof to match the existing gabled projection at the front of the house.

5. The appeal property is on a relatively spacious plot and as such the extension would not appear overlarge, relative to the overall plot size. Although the proposed first floor front extension would extend the front of the appeal property, the degree of projection would not appear excessive due to the staggered built form along Huntsmans Gate. Whilst the proposed front extension would be located in a relatively prominent position, it would be seen in the context of the current varied architectural styles around the host property and in the surrounding area.

6. Against this backdrop, the scale, form and design of the proposed front extension, set back and stepped down within a staggered frontage, would not appear significantly out of place or excessive in relation to the built form of the host property and the adjacent properties. The modest overall scale and proportions of the proposed front extension, together with the use of matching materials and fenestrations would ensure the proposal would sit relatively unobtrusively against the two storey form of the main property. The proposed front extension would therefore achieve an appropriate degree of subordination to the host property and as such would limit any significant adverse impacts on the street scene.

7. Consequently, I conclude that the proposed development would not have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host property and the area. It would be consistent with 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.

Living conditions of the occupiers of the neighbouring property

8. The proposed first floor front extension would be located adjacent to the two storey detached property at No. 12 Huntsmans Gate (No. 12), to the east of the site. The proposed front extension would be set back from the common shared boundary with No. 12 and would be separated from the rooms and garden at the front of the adjacent property by a pedestrian accessway running between the properties. The main front elevation of the detached property at No. 12 is also set forward in front of No. 14 due to the staggered built form along Huntsmans Gate.

9. Whilst I accept that there would be some impact from the development, given the proposed design and layout of the proposed first floor front extension, set back and stepped down, together with the separation distance between the properties and the orientation of the buildings, I consider that the proposed front extension would not result in significant overshadowing to the main

habitable rooms and garden at the front of No. 12, nor significantly dominate the views to cause an overbearing effect and an unacceptable sense of enclosure at the front of No. 12.

10. Consequently, I conclude that the proposed first floor front extension would not result in an unacceptable impact on the living conditions of the occupiers of the neighbouring property at No. 12 Huntsmans Gate with particular regard to overshadowing and outlook. It would be consistent with the overall aims of Policy LP17 of the Peterborough Local Plan 2019. This policy, amongst other things, seeks to ensure that development proposals do not result in an unacceptable impact on the amenity of existing occupiers of any nearby properties in terms of overshadowing and overbearing impacts.

Conditions

11. Having regard to the National Planning Policy Framework, and in particular paragraph 56, I have considered the conditions suggested by the Council. In addition to the standard time limit condition, I have specified the approved plans as this provides certainty. In order to protect the character and appearance of the area and safeguard the amenities of the nearby residents, I have imposed a condition requiring matching external materials.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above and having considered all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

David Troy

INSPECTOR