



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 January 2024

by Ian McHugh DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14th February 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/J0540/D/23/3326293

15 Temple Grange, Peterborough, PE4 5DN

- 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 and Mrs O'Hanlon against the decision of Peterborough City Council.
 - The application Ref 23/00103/HHFUL, dated 30 January 2023, was refused by notice dated 3 May 2023.
 - The development proposed is a new detached garage, conversion of existing garage to create a study and re-model existing wc.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the streetscene.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a detached dwelling with integral garage, which is situated within a modern residential estate. It is set-back from the road and it has a relatively long front garden. Although the appellant has referred to other garage in front garden locations, my observations during my site visit is that these are not common features in the streetscene.
4. The proposal is to erect a detached double garage within the front garden of the property. The existing integral garage would be converted into a study and an existing wc would be re-modelled. The proposed garage would be positioned close to the side boundary of the neighbouring property and close to the highway and pavement. I have noted that the plans were amended during the course of the application process and that the garage is now smaller than originally proposed.
5. Policy LP16 of the adopted Peterborough Local Plan 2019 (LP) states (amongst other things) that developments are expected to positively contribute to the character of the area having regard to local patterns of development. This policy accords with paragraph 135 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2023, which states that planning decisions should ensure that developments add to the quality of the area, are visually attractive and sympathetic to local character.

6. Although I consider the design of garage itself (including the proposed external materials) to be acceptable, it would appear as an unduly prominent and discordant feature in the streetscene, which would be at odds with the prevailing pattern of development in the area.
7. As stated above, isolated garages in front gardens are not common in the vicinity of the appeal site and in that respect the proposal would appear out of context and harmful to the appearance of the streetscene. Furthermore, I am not persuaded that the impact of the proposal could be mitigated by any landscaping.
8. I have compared the appeal proposal to the other garages in the locality that have been drawn to my attention by the appellant. However, they are positioned closer to existing dwellings and, in my opinion, they do not have the same impact on the streetscene as the appeal proposal would.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the proposal would have an unacceptable impact on the appearance of the streetscene and it would conflict with Policy LP16 of the LP. Therefore, it is concluded that the appeal be dismissed.

Ian McHugh

INSPECTOR