



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 January 2025

by **S Pearce BA(Hons) MPlan MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19th February 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/J0540/W/24/3350982

49 Southfields Drive, Stanground, Peterborough PE2 8PX

- 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 Dhillon's Property Management Limited against the decision of Peterborough City Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/00061/FUL.
 - The development proposed is described as “residential development comprising attached one bed dwelling”.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. Since the determination of the application, a revised National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) was published on 12 December 2024 and amended on 7 February 2025. Those parts of the Framework most relevant to the appeal have not been amended. As a result, I consider that there is no requirement for me to seek further submissions on the Framework, and I am satisfied that no parties interests would be prejudiced by my taking this approach.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The appeal site is a prominent corner plot, which comprises the side garden serving 49 Southfields Drive. It is located at the junction of Southfields Drive and Lawson Avenue. The built form surrounding this junction, while of varied design, heights and uses, is largely set back from the highway, thereby creating an open and spacious area. This is further reinforced through wide pavements, grassed verges and predominantly open corner plots, including the appeal site.
5. The proposed property would adjoin No 49 and would be set back from the established building line along Southfields Drive. While the proposed property has been designed to be subservient to No 49 and make better use of under-utilised land, it would extend almost the full width of the appeal site. As such, although the positioning of the property would not interfere with views when approaching from the south along Southfields Drive, its side elevation would be close to the highway boundary. The proposal would, therefore, erode the side garden serving No 49 and, in turn, the spaciousness of the corner plot. Consequently, the proposed

development would result in an incongruous form of development, at odds with the prevailing character and appearance of the area.

6. Other sites located on corner plots have been drawn to my attention. Based on the evidence submitted, these examples are not directly comparable, as they have a different quantum of development, form an extension to a property and, in some cases, the site location and height of development differs. In any case, I have had regard to this appeal based on its own merits.
7. For the above reasons, the proposed development would result in unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the area. This is contrary to Policy LP16 of the Peterborough Local Plan 2019 (LP), which states, among other things, that all development proposals are expected to positively contribute to the character and local distinctiveness of the area and create a sense of place.

Other Matters

8. The appeal scheme would contribute towards the area's housing supply. As such, it would support the Government's objective of significantly boosting the supply of homes, in a location within walking distance to a wide range of facilities, including schools, recreational space and retail units, and with connectivity for various modes of transport, including safe pedestrian routes.
9. The appellant contends that the appeal scheme will exceed current Building Regulation specifications and the Described National Space Standards, and, as it seeks to re-purpose the land, would have no impact upon infrastructure. While it is asserted that the proposal provides for an identified local housing need, there is little evidence to demonstrate any such shortfall or demand. Given the scale of the proposed development, even cumulatively, these benefits attract limited weight.
10. It is noted that no public comments or objections were received, and the appeal scheme raises no environmental, archaeological, ecological, flood risk or drainage issues. An absence of harm in respect of these matters, and compliance with LP Policy LP17, are neutral matters, that neither weigh for or against the scheme.
11. The appellant highlights that the appeal scheme would replace the sectional garage, continuous run of tall close boarded fencing and side elevation of No 49. Moreover, it is noted that the dwelling would include dual primary aspects, has been designed to be respectful of its importance in the street scene and would introduce lower boundary fencing and landscaping. While these matters are noted, they do not overcome the harm identified in respect of the main issue.
12. Concerns have been raised in respect of the lack of pre-application service and the planning application process. These are matters between the appellant and Council and are outside the scope of the appeal.

Conclusion

13. For the above reasons, I conclude that the proposed development would conflict with the development plan as a whole. There are no material considerations, including the Framework, that indicate I should conclude other than in accordance with it. Therefore, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

S Pearce INSPECTOR