



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 January 2024

by K Allen MEng (Hons) MArch PGCert ARB

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 8 February 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/J0540/W/23/3318538

Land to rear of 1 Southfields Drive, Stanground, Peterborough PE2 8QA

- 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 W Ho against the decision of Peterborough City Council.
 - The application Ref 22/01245/FUL, dated 6 September 2022, was refused by notice dated 7 November 2022.
 - The development proposed is for the erection of a 2-storey 1-bed dwelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. Part E of the appeal form indicates that the description of development has not changed but, nevertheless, a different wording has been entered when compared to the application form. Neither of the main parties has provided written confirmation that a revised description of development has been agreed. The description of development provided in the application form contains additional information regarding the design. As the first sentence succinctly and accurately describes the development, I have used this description above.
3. The Government published a revised version of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) on 19 December 2023. Whilst this made certain revisions to aspects of national planning policy, the provisions in respect of the main issues of this case are largely unchanged. I am therefore satisfied that there is no requirement to seek further submissions on the revised Framework from the parties, and that no party would be disadvantaged by such a course of action.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the living conditions of the occupiers of Nos 1 and 3 Southfield Drive with regard to outlook.

Reasons

5. The proposal would have a frontage on Coneygree Road, adjacent to the flank elevation of No 128 and to the rear of Nos 1 and 3 Southfields Drive. Their rear gardens are modest in size and separated by high level walls/fencing. The outlook from the properties, including their gardens, is suburban. Other dwellings and gardens are visible, however they benefit from appropriate separation distances and relatively open outlooks at high level. D
6. Despite the reduction in size from the previous application¹, the dwelling would be positioned to the rear of No 1 Southfields Drive with a minimal separation

¹ Application Reference: 21/01355/FUL

distance. Whilst the rear garden of No 1 is already somewhat enclosed by the high-level boundary fencing, the proposal would be visible within the garden and would further enclose the limited garden space, beyond what would be typically expected within a suburban area. Although the slope of the roof away from No 1 would reduce the effect of the proposal, it would appear overbearing when viewed from within the modest rear garden.

7. The proposal would be in close proximity to and extend substantially along the boundary with No 3. The large outbuilding currently dominates the garden; however, its height is limited. Given the height of the proposed dwelling, it would protrude significantly above both the fence line and existing outbuilding with a large, blank expanse of brick visible at high level, that would dominate the space.
8. Therefore, I conclude that the proposal would unduly harm the living conditions of the occupiers of Nos 1 and 3 Southfields Drive with regard to outlook. It would conflict with Policy LP17 of the Peterborough Local Plan 2016-2036 (July 2019) where amongst other things it seeks to ensure that development does not have an overbearing impact on any nearby properties. There would also be conflict with the Framework where it requires that development creates places with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users.

Other Matters

9. My attention has been drawn to another appeal² for a 2-storey detached dwelling. Despite the proximity, there are fundamental differences to the appeal before me including the position and separation distances in relation to the surrounding dwellings. As such, the context would differ significantly, and so it does not lead me to a different view in this case.
10. The proposal would provide an additional dwelling in an accessible location on previously developed land, contributing to the local housing stock. Whilst the Framework seeks to boost the supply of housing, the social and economic benefits of a single dwelling would be limited. I appreciate the appellant's desire to enhance the visual amenity of the site, however this could be addressed by other means. In any case, these matters do not outweigh the harm I have identified above.
11. Although no objections have been raised by technical consultees and the existing garage is of no architectural or historic merit, these are neutral matters which neither weigh in favour of nor against the proposal.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the proposal conflicts with the development plan as a whole and there are no material considerations, including the Framework that would outweigh that conflict. Therefore, the appeal is dismissed.

K Allen

INSPECTOR

² Appeal Reference: APP/J0540/A/06/2007372