

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 August 2023

by R Gee BA (Hons) Dip TP PGCert UD MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 6 September 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/J0540/W/23/3314094

178A Mountsteven Avenue, Peterborough PE4 6HN

- 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 Apollo Medicines Ltd against the decision of Peterborough City Council.
 - The application Ref 22/01034/FUL, dated 13 May 2022, was refused by notice dated 20 October 2022.
 - The development proposed is described as proposed first floor extension.
-

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. The appeal site forms part of a small parade of commercial units on Mountsteven Avenue. No. 178A comprises a single storey commercial property located at the end of a larger commercial building. It is single storey with a flat roof and is set back from the highway with an area of hardstanding to the front of the premises.
4. Whilst the dwellings on the opposite side of the road from the appeal site and those further south on the eastern side of Mountsteven Road have a high degree of uniformity in form and appearance, including their front roof design, there is a greater degree of variety in the immediate location of the appeal site. Here development comprises commercial premises of a varied design and roof form, a two-storey block of flats with front facing gables and a single storey dwelling with a hipped roof.
5. Part of the building, to which the appeal site forms part of, is two-storey with a front facing hipped roof with the remaining being single storey with a flat roof. The proposal would introduce a first-floor element to the commercial premises with a single storey roof remaining in between. Owing to the width of the appeal site the proposed extension would be a narrow gable with a pitch roof significantly steeper than the existing two-storey element of the building.
6. The proportions of the proposed front facing gable roof would be significantly at odds with the nearby gable roof forms, which are generally wider in terms of their frontage width and shallower roof forms.

7. Even allowing for the mixed character of development in the immediate locality of the appeal site the design and scale of the proposed extension would appear as an incongruous addition to the streetscene. Consequently, the proposal would cause harm to the character and appearance of the area.
8. I concur that the materials proposed for the external finish of the development would have an appearance similar to development within the locality. However, this does not overcome the harm I have identified.
9. I conclude that the proposed development would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area. This would conflict with Policy LP16 of the Peterborough Local Plan. Amongst others, this requires development to contribute positively to the character and distinctiveness of the area.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above and taking account of the National Planning Policy Framework and all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

R Gee

INSPECTOR