



Appeal Decision

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

Decision by John Morrison BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 3 December 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/J0540/W/24/3341455

6 Peacock Way, Bretton, Peterborough PE3 9AA

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Jackson against the decision of Peterborough City Council.
 - The application Ref is 23/01404/FUL.
 - The development proposed is described as a new build 2 bedroom bungalow dwelling on land adjacent to 6 Peacock Way, with associated landscaping.
-

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.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal site forms the side garden of No 6 Peacock Way and abuts the side boundary of No 4. It is a corner plot and, together with the corresponding area adjacent to No 2 and other gardens and building setbacks, provides a pleasing sense of spaciousness to the street scene that contributes positively to the character and appearance of the area. The appeal site itself also provides pleasant relief to which is an otherwise densely developed locality.
5. The immediate area comprises a mix of bungalows and two-storey dwellings. Although the proposed bungalow would be reflective of the existing dwellings in terms of its design and scale, and it would largely adhere to the building lines of the adjacent properties, it would encroach onto the open space. Whilst the bungalow would be of a smaller scale than the previous proposal for a two-storey dwelling¹, the loss of the side garden area would substantially reduce the feeling of spaciousness to the detriment of the quality of the street scene.
6. The existing boundary hedge would provide some screening of the proposed bungalow, but it could be reduced in height or removed completely at any

¹ Planning application ref. 22/01032/FUL, planning appeal ref. APP/J0540/W/22/3308937

time. In any case, any screening from the hedge would not sufficiently mitigate the loss of the open space and how it contributes to the area's character.

7. For these reasons, the proposal would cause harm to the character and appearance of the area. As such, it would be contrary to Policy LP16 of the Peterborough Local Plan 2016-2036 (2019). This policy seeks, amongst other things, for development to positively contribute to the character of the area and to respond appropriately to local patterns of development. It would also conflict with Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2023) (the Framework), which requires that development should be sympathetic to local character.

Other Matters

8. While the side garden area may not currently be used as such, there are no restrictions to prevent the current or future occupiers from using it so. I am therefore not persuaded that the site is under-utilised for the purposes of paragraph 124 of the Framework.
9. The provision of one additional unit would make a small contribution to the existing housing supply. Economic advantages would also arise from the construction and occupation of a new house, although some of these would be temporary and limited by the scale of the scheme. I would therefore ascribe limited weight to these matters.

Conclusion and Recommendation

10. The proposal would be contrary to the development plan and there are no material considerations worthy of sufficient weight that would indicate a decision other than in accordance therewith. I therefore recommend the appeal be dismissed.

Darren Ellis

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

John Morrison

INSPECTOR