



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 June 2023

by S. Hartley BA (Hons) Dist.TP (Manc) DMS MRTPI MRICS

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21st June 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/J0540/W/22/3308694

91 Sallows Road, Peterborough PE1 4EX

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a failure to give notice within the prescribed period of a decision on an application for planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Adeel Ghaus against Peterborough City Council.
 - The application Ref 22/00892/HHFUL is dated 25 June 2022.
 - The development proposed is for one and two storey extensions.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. This is an appeal against the Council's failure to determine the planning application within the statutory timescale. The local planning authority (LPA) has explained the reasons why it would have refused planning permission had it been in a position so to do. In this context, the main issue is the effect of the proposed development upon the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is in a residential area of mainly detached and semi-detached dwellings, set back from Sallows Road sufficiently to provide front amenity spaces which are frequently used for off-street parking purposes. There are gaps between the dwellings, though several have single-story infills. Nevertheless, there are views of trees and the sky above them. The gaps, even with single storey infills, add significantly and positively to the character and appearance of the area.
4. The proposed development is for a two-storey side extension. It would extend close to the side boundary of the property, leaving a gap of some 600mm. The effect would be to detract from the rhythm of open gaps between properties, creating a terrace-type effect to the detriment of the character and appearance of the area.
5. The appellant has referred to examples where two storey side extensions have been built, effectively up to the boundaries of their host properties. However, these are the exception to the norm. Furthermore, I do not know the exact circumstances that led to these extensions being constructed. The LPA notes that several were approved prior to the adoption of the current development plan. In addition, where they do exist, including such extensions to dwellings directly opposite to the appeal site, I find that they have resulted in a

continuous frontage of built form which adversely affects the character and appearance of the area.

6. While the extensions to dwellings directly opposite to the appeal site have resulted in a terracing effect, gaps between properties on the side of the road where the appeal property is sited and in its immediate area remain – though the adjoining property at No 93 Sallows Road already has a two storey addition which extends to its boundary. Should the appeal be allowed, the adverse terracing effect would be replicated and intensified on this side of Sallows Road as well.
7. The LPA raises no objections to the proposed single storey rear extension, and I have no reason to disagree.
8. In view of the above, I conclude that when the development is considered as a whole, it conflicts with Policy LP16 of the Peterborough Local Plan 2019 and Chapter 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2021 which seek to ensure that new development is of good design which reflects the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

9. For the above reasons, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

S Hartley

INSPECTOR