



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 September 2024 by Darren Ellis MPlan MRTPI

Decision by A Price BSc MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26 November 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/J0540/W/24/3337489

Land to rear of 38 Peakirk Road, Ginton, Peterborough, Cambs PE6 7LT

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant outline planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Andrew Hutchinson against the decision of Peterborough City Council.
 - The application Ref is 23/01383/OUT.
 - The development proposed is described on the application form as '2no proposed bungalows and access drive on land to rear of 38 Peakirk Road.'
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Preliminary Matters

3. The application was submitted in outline with all matters except for access reserved for subsequent approval. Accordingly, I have assessed the appeal proposal on that basis and have considered the submitted plans as indicative except where they relate to access.

Main Issues

4. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on a) the character and appearance of the area; and b) highway safety.

Reasons for the Recommendation

Character and appearance

5. The appeal site consists of part of the rear garden of 38 Peakirk Road (No 38). 30-38 Peakirk Road (Nos 30-38) are detached dwellings which front directly onto Peakirk Road, with long rear gardens. They are the last dwellings along Peakirk Road in Ginton. The properties on Clarendon Way are situated behind dwellings further along Peakirk Road, however the lack of development behind Nos 30-38 provides a pleasant sense of openness and contributes to a positive transition between Ginton and the open countryside adjacent to No 38.
6. The proposed bungalows would be constructed to the rear of No 38 and would not front the street. Accordingly, they would be out-of-keeping with the

predominantly linear, street-fronting pattern of development of Nos 30-38. Furthermore, even though the bungalows would not be readily visible from the street, glimpsed views would be possible. The proposal would reduce the open qualities of the site and the increased density of the dwellings would detract from the transition from the built-up area to the open countryside here.

7. My attention is drawn to the bungalow at 5 Helpston Road, Glinton, which was allowed on appeal¹. This is situated in a backland position but has other buildings on all sides and the site is not situated at the edge of the settlement or adjacent to the countryside. As such this example is not directly comparable to the proposal before me and does not justify the appeal scheme.
8. For these reasons, the proposal would cause harm to the character and appearance of the area and as such would be contrary to Policies LP16 and LP27 of the Peterborough Local Plan 2016-2036 (2019) (LP). These policies seek, amongst other things, for development to positively contribute to the character of the area, to respond appropriately to local patterns of development and for development adjoining the countryside to be sensitive to its landscape setting.
9. Policy GNP2 of the Glinton Village Neighbourhood Plan 2016-2036 (2021) (NP), states that development within the village envelope will be supported in principle where it satisfies the policies of the Development Plan. Given the conflict with the LP Policies above, the proposal would also fail to accord with NP Policy GNP2.

Highway safety

10. A new vehicular access would be provided to serve the proposal. It is proposed to position this adjacent to the existing site access. However, the Council's highway specialists have recommended that only a single, shared access is provided. In either case, it is likely that only a limited number of vehicle movements would take place here each day, given the scale and nature of the scheme. Moreover, there is a grass verge in between the front boundary treatment and the pavement, and the appeal site is located on the outside of a gentle bend in the road. Drivers exiting in a forward gear from either access would therefore have a good view of the pavement in both directions before their vehicle crosses the pavement. For these reasons, the risk of a collision between a vehicle and pedestrian or cyclist would be very low.
11. I note the Council's concerns regarding the visibility splays. However, given the position of the site on the outside of a bend and based on the evidence before me, I have no reason to conclude that the required visibility splays could not be achieved.
12. Furthermore, the required visibility splays, details regarding the surface and drainage of the access, and the location of the proposed gate could all be secured with appropriately worded conditions to maintain highway safety.
13. The proposed turning area and car and cycle parking for each dwelling would be details to consider during a future reserved matters application for layout.

¹ Planning appeal ref. APP/J0540/W/18/3211889

14. Overall, the proposal would not be detrimental to highway safety. The proposal would therefore accord with the aims of LP Policy LP13, which seeks to protect highway safety as well as walking and cycling connections.
15. The Council also cite a conflict with NP Policy GNP6. However, this policy relates to the natural environment and does not have any regard to highway safety.

Other Matters

16. I note a number of matters raised by the appellant, such as the acceptable effect of the proposal on the living conditions of neighbouring properties, the design of the proposed dwellings, the scheme making efficient use of the land, and the development meeting Building Regulations. However, these matters are not in dispute between the appellant and Council. Furthermore, some of these matters would be considered in more detail during a future reserved matters application(s). Nevertheless, the lack of harm in these respects is a neutral factor and does not change my conclusions in relation to the character and appearance of the area identified above.

Conclusion and Recommendation

17. There are no material considerations which indicate that a decision should be made other than in accordance with the development plan. Therefore, for the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal be dismissed.

Darren Ellis

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

18. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

A Price

INSPECTOR