

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 May 2024

by J Bell-Williamson MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 5th June 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/J0540/D/23/3334889

48 Monument Street, Peterborough PE1 4AG

- 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 Edvins Panichuks against the decision of Peterborough City Council.
 - The application Ref 23/01070/HHFUL, dated 17 August 2023, was refused by notice dated 1 December 2023.
 - The development proposed is ground floor extension, internal alterations and creation of front parking space.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The original description of development is provided in a more succinct form in the decision notice. Therefore, the above description reflects this amended description.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the street scene; and on parking and highway safety.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. The appeal property is a two storey mid-terrace dwelling in a residential road of similar properties laid out in terraces as well as detached and semi-detached dwellings. The Council indicates that while the site lies outside the nearby Park Conservation Area, the street comprises a number of non-designated heritage assets, including the appeal property, which reflects the expansion of the city in the Victorian period.
 5. Policy LP16 of the Peterborough Local Plan 2016-2036 (2019) states that all development proposals are expected to positively contribute to the character and local distinctiveness of the area, and to respect the context of the site and surrounding area. Policy LP19 concerns the historic environment and requires that development must respect the local character and distinctiveness of the
-

area in which it would be situated and that all heritage assets, including non-designated ones, should be protected.

6. The terraced and detached dwellings in this part of Monument Street appear to largely reflect their original character and appearance. Changes are most evident in terms of replacement doors and windows. The terraces typically include rear access via passageways between properties. No 48 is unusual in this regard as it includes a coach entrance that enabled vehicular access to the rear. This is currently enclosed to the front by a metal grille and gate that enables views to the rear.
7. The proposed shower room would be set well back from the property's frontage and I note that the Council considers this to be acceptable. The creation of the garage would, however, result in a metal roller door further forward within the opening. While the grille and gate would be retained and the roller door would be set back from the property's frontage, the new door would be highly visible within the street scene and from dwellings opposite.
8. The proposed garage door would be a more substantive and prominent feature within the relatively large coach entrance than the modern doors and windows to many properties. Due to its material, design and overall appearance its overtly modern and utilitarian appearance would detract from the character and appearance of the non-designated heritage asset. As such, it would result in a materially harmful degree of change to the appeal property.
9. The Council indicates that limited details of the appearance of the new boundary wall and parking area have been provided. I note, however, that if the proposal was otherwise acceptable, further information about these elements would have been sought. As such, the principal consideration with regard to parking is addressed under the second main issue.
10. I have had regard to the fact that part of the reason for the proposal is for security and privacy, and to improve energy efficiency. However, these matters are not reliant on the particular form of front enclosure proposed.
11. Accordingly, for these reasons, I conclude that the proposal would have an unacceptably harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the street scene. Therefore, it is contrary to Policies LP16 and LP19 of the Peterborough Local Plan 2016-2036, as described. It is also contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), which advocates good design.

Parking and highway safety

12. The proposal includes the removal of the angled part of the front boundary wall and surfacing the front garden to create a single parking space. This would enable a vehicle to enter the site and park parallel to the dwelling's front elevation. However, due to the limited size of the space and the presence of the front boundary wall, there would be insufficient room to turn and manoeuvre a vehicle such that it could leave the site in forward gear. Consequently, vehicles using the space would need to enter or leave the space in reverse gear.

13. There is one other example nearby of this type of off-street parking arrangement, at No 58 and, therefore, the majority of properties in this part of the street rely on residents' on-street parking. In these circumstances, due to the extensive on-street parking and narrowness of the street, and despite likely low vehicle speeds, use of the proposed access as described would create the potential for conflict between vehicles. This is particularly the case where the lack of off-street parking means that the reversing movements required to enter or exit the space are not a common vehicle manoeuvre within the street.
14. I have had regard to the appellant's contention that there is not enough on-street parking capacity, which is part of the reason for the proposal. However, this is not sufficient reason to outweigh the above findings concerning the effect on highway safety.
15. Therefore, for the reasons given, I conclude that the proposal would result in material harm to highway safety. As such, it is contrary to Policy LP13 of the Local Plan, which requires that development must make appropriate provision for safe, convenient and sustainable access. It is also contrary to the Framework, which states that development should only be prevented on highway grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety¹.

Conclusion

16. For the reasons given the appeal should not succeed.

J Bell-Williamson

INSPECTOR

¹ Paragraph 115.