



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 April 2025

by **D Ellis MPlan MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15th May 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/J0540/D/25/3360547

40 Churchfield Road, Walton, Peterborough PE4 6HE

- 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 Aras Alan against the decision of Peterborough City Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/01420/HHFUL.
 - The development proposed is front canopy including GRP columns and addition of mosaic tiles to ground floor front elevation.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. I have included the addition of mosaic tiles to the ground floor front elevation in the header above, in line with the description found on the Decision Notice and appeal form, as it is a more accurate description of the development. I have also removed the term 'retrospective' as it is not an act of development.
3. At the time of my site visit the proposed canopy and mosaic tiles had already been installed, and the application form confirms this was completed in September 2024. I have proceeded with the appeal on this basis.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host property and the area.

Reasons

5. The appeal property is situated in a prominent location on a corner plot at the junction of Churchfield Road and Croyland Road. The properties in the area are predominantly semi-detached or terraced and are finished in a variety of materials. The appeal property is a detached dwelling which is considerably larger than the nearby dwellings, which increases its prominence.
6. The mosaic tiles do not appear out of place given the variety of materials in the street scene. However, I observed that existing porches and canopies in the surrounding area were modest in terms of width and projection and do not feature Greek-style columns. The substantial height and width of the canopy and the considerable forwards projection of the central part of the canopy, which projects further forward than the established building line, gives it an uncomfortably large and bulky appearance. This would be exacerbated by the property's prominence

on the corner plot. Consequently, the canopy overly dominates the front elevation of the property and jars with the modest porches and canopies in the area.

7. The appellant has provided photographs of examples of canopies with columns, however none of these canopies have a central projection like the appeal scheme. Furthermore, these examples are in different areas of Peterborough and as such they have no bearing on the street scene at the appeal site. I also have no details before me of any planning permissions for these other canopies and columns. For these reasons, these examples are not directly comparable to, and do not justify, the scheme before me.
8. Overall, the proposal is an incongruous addition to the dwelling as a result of its bulk, scale and design and, consequently, it causes harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area. The canopy therefore conflicts with Policy LP16 of the Peterborough Local Plan 2016 to 2036 (July 2019), insofar as it requires development to respect the context of the site and surrounding area and to respond appropriately to building form including size, scale and massing.

Conclusion

9. The canopy conflicts with the development plan as a whole. The material considerations, including the National Planning Policy Framework, do not indicate that the appeal should be decided other than in accordance with it. The appeal is therefore dismissed.

D Ellis

INSPECTOR