



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 May 2022

By A. J. Boughton MA (IPSD) Dip.Arch. Dip.(Conservation) RIBA MRTPI
an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 24 June 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/J0540/D/22/3294833
259 Eastern Avenue Peterborough PE1 4QA

- 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 Miss N Bonnaud against the decision of Peterborough City Council.
 - The application Ref: 22/00020/HHFUL, dated 6 January 2022, was refused by notice dated 3 March 2022.
 - The development proposed is single storey front and two storey side extensions.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. 259 Eastern Avenue sits within an extensive area of predominantly semi-detached twentieth-century housing which have a notable consistency as to appearance and relationship with the street. From my observations this broad visual consistency defines the character and appearance of the street and derives not only from the frontage alignment of the dwelling pairs but also, and significantly in this case, a very limited palette of materials. In particular, the ubiquity of facing brick and near-total absence of render in the vicinity of the appeal site underpins the character and appearance of the area around the appeal site. Where render is used in the original design, such as in some dwellings in Acacia Avenue, it is used in ways which respect the paired symmetry of the dwellings concerned.
4. Policy LP16 of the adopted Peterborough Local Plan (2019); seek to retain local distinctiveness by the use of appropriate, high-quality materials, to ensure development is of high quality, looking to reinforce or retain local distinctiveness through high quality design.
5. 259 Eastern Avenue and its paired dwelling are located on corner plots at the junction with Acacia Avenue, therefore outwith the general alignment of housing but prominently located. Whereas, on balance, alterations to the

dwelling conducted in appropriate materials such as previously permitted¹ would not be unduly intrusive and by the use of these materials subsume the physical changes into the generality of the street scene, the asymmetric application of render to one of the building pair would conspicuously undermine the austere simplicity of the original dwelling and its pair. This would interrupt the even visual flow along the adjoining frontages by drawing attention to the obtrusively different texture and colour of the subject dwelling.

6. I therefore conclude that the proposal conflicts with Policy LP16 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019) and consequently, the proposal would not accord with the development plan taken as a whole. Therefore, for these reasons and taking all matters raised into account, the appeal cannot succeed.

Andrew Boughton

INSPECTOR

¹ 21/00534/HHFUL