
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 December 2021

by Gary Deane BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12th January 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/J0540/D/21/3285283

91B Glinton Road, Helpston, Peterborough PE6 7DG

- 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 James Wilde against the decision of Peterborough City Council.
 - The application Ref 21/00902/HHFUL, dated 21 May 2021, was refused by notice dated 11 August 2021.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a first storey bedroom extension (retrospective).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of a first storey bedroom extension (retrospective) at 91B Glinton Road, Helpston, Peterborough PE6 7DG in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 21/00902/HHFUL, dated 21 May 2021, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Ref 4769/1 A and the plans showing the Existing Elevations and the Existing Ground and First Floor Layouts.
 - 2) 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.

Procedural matters

2. An application for costs was made by the appellants against the Council. This application is the subject of a separate decision.
3. The proposed extension is in place. From the photographs provided and my own observations, it broadly reflects the details shown on the drawings with two notable differences. Firstly, the submitted plans show a blank wall rather than a first floor rear window and a Juliette style balcony that appear from the photographs to be in place. Secondly, a first floor window is proposed in the new side elevation. For the avoidance of doubt, I have assessed the appeal scheme as it is shown on the plans because it was on that basis that the Council decided to withhold planning permission. As such, the development sought is partly retrospective.

Main issue

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

Reasons

5. The appeal property is a mainly 2-storey detached house of individual design that addresses Ginton Road within a predominantly residential area wherein buildings vary in style, age, type, size and general appearance. As a result, there is considerable variety to the appearance of the existing built form in both the street scene and the local area to which No 91B belongs.
6. The appeal dwelling stands reasonably close to the highway behind a shallow grassed area and a low-level brick wall. The house has a wide front elevation relative to its modest depth into the plot. With also its largely open highway frontage, No 91B is a significant and prominent feature on the immediate approach to the site along Ginton Road, from both directions.
7. Compared to the dwelling before the first floor extension was in place, No 91B is significantly larger with noticeably wider 2-storey front and rear elevations. Nevertheless, the appeal scheme has been carefully designed to reflect the style of the host building. Continuing the ridge and eaves levels of the main house has resulted in a more homogenous roof form than was previously the case. Matching external materials have been used and the window openings, as constructed and proposed, are in keeping with the pattern of fenestration in the host building. For these reasons, the appeal dwelling has an acceptable appearance with the new extension in place. While the building has been significantly changed on three sides, it retains the qualities and the character of an individually designed detached dwelling.
8. I agree that No 91B would have gained some prominence in the street scene given that the new addition is clearly visible from the road. While the appellants state that the surface area of the extension is only 6.2sqm, amounting to just 11.6% of entire façade, its visual impact is proportionately much greater than the numerical assessment would imply. Even so, it continues to stand comfortably and confidently within the plot with the new built form in place. Despite the additional 2-storey width of the building, it does not look out of place nor appear obtrusive among the highly varied existing development that characterises the local area.
9. On the main issue, I therefore conclude that the proposed development is in keeping with the character and appearance of the local area. Accordingly, it does not conflict with Policy LP16 of the Peterborough Local Plan 2016 to 2036, which states that all development proposals are expected to positively contribute to the character and distinctiveness of the local area. It also complies with the principles and policies of the Peterborough Design and Development in Selected Villages Supplementary Planning Document (SPD). Of particular relevance is SPD Policy Help 2, which states that all housing developments should be in keeping with the character of the surrounding area.

Conditions

10. As the development has started, it is unnecessary to impose the standard time limit condition. It is, however, incomplete and so it is necessary to impose a condition that requires the development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans for certainty. To ensure the satisfactory appearance of the development, a condition is imposed to require that external materials used match those of the existing building.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons set out above, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Gary Deane

INSPECTOR