



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 April 2023

by N Duff BSc (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21 August 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/J0540/W/22/3307798

Land to south of Newport Way, Ufford, Peterborough

- 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 A Brown against the decision of Peterborough City Council.
 - The application Ref 21/01950/FUL, dated 13 December 2021, was refused by notice dated 6 May 2022.
 - The development proposed is Erection of a Detached Two Storey Dwelling with Associated Hard and Soft Landscaping and Detached Single Storey Garage with Tractor Store on Land to the South of Newport Way, Ufford Easting 509546 Northing 303815.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. The Council's decision notice refers to two reasons for refusal, however, due to nature of the reasons which are connected, I have considered them under one main issue. Consequently, I am satisfied that no party will be prejudiced by my approaching the matters in this way.

Main Issue

3. Whether the proposed development would be in a suitable location having regard to the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. The site is a field located outside of the village boundary of Ufford in the open countryside. The site has an agricultural building located near to the entrance of the site with open fields beyond to the east and south, and a children's play area located to the west of the site. Residential gardens back onto the site that serve dwellings along Newport Way to the north. The site has a very open and rural character and forms the boundary between the village and the open countryside beyond.
5. The principle of residential development has been established at the site through an extant planning permission, which approved a single dwelling replacing the existing agricultural building. Having regard to policy LP11 of the Peterborough Local Plan 2016 to 2036 Adopted 24 July 2019 (LP), the proposal does not meet the detailed criteria set out in the policy with regard to a new dwelling in the countryside, however there is no dispute with regard to the principle of a dwellinghouse secured by the extant permission and I have no

basis to consider it differently. This decision relates to the expanded elements of the proposal over and above the extant permission, including an outbuilding to provide a tractor/hay store along with an extension to the previously approved residential curtilage and an increased area of hardstanding for vehicle parking and turning.

6. The proposed outbuilding would be of a significant size. Whilst it would have a modest height when compared to the proposed dwellinghouse, the width and depth of the proposed building means its scale is substantial and does exceed the width of the proposed dwelling. This together with the positioning of the outbuilding to the side of the dwelling and ground coverage of the site would not be subservient in nature to the main dwelling. Furthermore, the amount of development on the site would go above and beyond replacing the existing agricultural building. The proposed hardstanding would partly be located inside the extended residential curtilage along with part of the outbuilding itself. However, the expansion of hardstanding and curtilage combined with the outbuilding itself would see a further encroachment into open countryside.
7. The proposed materials and design of the buildings are acceptable and appropriate in a rural context in relation to the proposed dwelling, however this does not outweigh the harm identified.
8. Justification for the agricultural element of the proposed outbuilding has been put forward relating to the rearing of sheep by providing a hay store and maintaining and caring for the grassland meadow, requiring the agricultural equipment store. The building encompasses all garaging and storage facilities for domestic and agricultural use in one building as opposed to separate buildings. Whilst I acknowledge that having both uses in one building would be practical and would result in a tighter cluster of development on the site, for the reasons mentioned this does not outweigh the harm identified to the character and appearance of the area.
9. For these reasons, I conclude on this issue that the proposed development would cause undue harm to the rural character and appearance of the area. As such, it would be contrary to Policy LP2 of the LP which seeks to reinforce the distinction between built up areas and countryside to protect character of the landscape. The proposal would also be contrary to Policies LP16 and LP27 of the LP which require proposals to contribute to the character and distinctiveness of the area and to enhance landscape character.
10. For the reasons mentioned, the proposal would be contrary to The National Design Guide in that the proposal would not integrate into its wider surroundings visually and the surrounding context beyond the site boundary. Furthermore, the proposal would not be consistent with relevant paragraph of chapter 15 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) which amongst other things requires decisions to contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside.

Other Matter

11. The appellant has put forward a benefit of the development comprising a climate resistant dwelling. Whilst this is a benefit of the scheme, as this only relates to a single dwelling it only attracts limited weight in the overall planning balance and does not outweigh the harm identified.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons set out above, I conclude that the proposed development would not accord with policies LP2, LP16 and LP27 of the LP. Although the development does not conflict with other policies of the development plan, this leads me to conclude that the proposal conflicts with the development plan as a whole. It also does not accord with the Framework. Thus, and having had regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is dismissed.

N Duff

INSPECTOR

