



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 June 2025

by **Andrew Dale BA (Hons) MA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26 June 2025

Appeal Ref. APP/J0540/D/25/3362877

42 Oak Road, Glinton, Peterborough PE6 7LD

- 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 Oakley Symak against the decision of Peterborough City Council.
 - The application ref. is 24/01482/HHFUL.
 - The development proposed is: Front and side two storey extension to dwelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main issues

2. Covering the 3 reasons for refusal on the Council's decision notice, I consider the main issues to be the implications of the proposed development, in terms of its siting and scale, for the character and appearance of the surrounding area, for the amenity of the occupants of 44 Oak Road, and for car parking at the host property.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. Paired with no. 40, the appeal property is a semi-detached, 2-storey house. The residential layout found along the northern side of Oak Road, where the appeal property is situated, is characterised by semi-detached and detached houses which follow a fairly regular building line and do not exhibit any 2-storey forward additions to their original built form. This local pattern of development is important in maintaining a sense of place and makes a positive contribution to the local character and appearance of the area.
 4. The principle of extending the property and adapting it to meet the changing needs of the current occupants is not at issue. However, I consider that the extension, owing to its prominent forward siting and notable scale, would not sit comfortably in this street scene. Its protrusion forwards and sideways over 2 storeys would be wholly at odds with the built form of other nearby properties and would result in an incongruous interruption to the linear pattern and spacing of development here.
 5. The failure to respect the context of the site and the disruption to the prevailing pattern of development would harm the character and appearance of the surrounding area. In so doing, the proposal would eschew the requirements for good
-

design within Policy LP16 of the Peterborough Local Plan 2019 (LP) and Policy GNP3 of the Glington Village Neighbourhood Plan 2021 (NP). Good design is also a cornerstone of the National Planning Policy Framework.

6. The appellant has submitted a photograph of an allegedly comparable development. I identified this to be at 16 Elm Crescent. This is an isolated example of a similar development on the same residential estate. It is some distance away from the appeal site and not part of the same street scene. I saw that as the extension at 16 Elm Crescent does not overlap the side of the house, the 2-storey front projection there is not as wide as the one proposed at 42 Oak Road. Still, it is not a good example to follow as the extension looks out of place in the Elm Crescent street scene. In any event, it is an established planning principle that each case is considered on its own merits. Moreover, there is no evidence before me about the planning history of this other case, so I do not know if that extension was approved under the same and current development plan policies.

Amenity of the occupants of 44 Oak Road

7. Policy LP17 of the LP and Policy GNP3 of the NP seek to ensure that new development does not result in an unacceptable impact on the amenity of existing occupiers of any nearby properties. The Council's sole concern on this issue was with the potential for overbearing and overshadowing impacts upon 44 Oak Road.
8. The maximum projection of the proposed extension from the forwardmost ground floor front wall of the appeal property would be 1.4m. Whilst the extension would reach across so as to be only 790mm from the common boundary with no. 44, like the appellant I am not convinced it would cross the 45 degree line taken in a horizontal plane and measured from the centre point of the neighbour's nearest primary habitable room front windows which serve a living room below a bedroom. Such a 45 degree code is often used to determine the acceptability or otherwise of extensions in terms of their overshadowing or overbearing impacts.
9. There is a narrow east-facing side light in the front bay window to the ground floor living room at no. 44. This would directly oppose the blank side wall of the proposed extension but it is not the principal front window to that room. So, whilst there may be some diminution in the daylight and morning sunlight reaching and the outlook from that section of the bay window and some reduction in the existing levels of privacy from the narrowing of the passageway alongside no. 42, I consider that the living conditions in that room would not, for any reason, be so unacceptably impacted as to bring the scheme into conflict with LP Policy LP17 and NP Policy GNP3.

Car parking at the host property

10. There is a requirement for a minimum of 2 on-plot car parking spaces for dwellings with 3 bedrooms like no. 42, as existing and as proposed to be extended.
11. The scheme on drawing PL01B seeks to rely on 2 such spaces in the front garden.
12. The Local Highway Authority (LHA) objected to the application and, according to the Delegated Report, said that the site plan on drawing PL01B showed car parking spaces that are not acceptable to the adopted standards.

13. The LHA requires a minimum length of 5m where a car is parked in front of a wall or 6m in front of an entrance doorway or side passageway to allow for safe access to and egress from a property. I agree with the LHA that the 6m distance would be apt in this case on the basis of the general parking layout shown on drawing PL01B.
14. The basic site plan on drawing PL01B is not annotated with detailed survey measurements of the depth or width of the front garden area. There is little more than 6m between the forwardmost ground floor wall of the house and the back edge of the public footway. Drawing PL01B would suggest that there is 7m or more between them. This is not the case. If the front extension is to be 1.4m in depth from the forwardmost ground floor front wall of the house as stated on the plans, then the LHA's estimate that the remaining driveway would be only 4.65m long seems to me to be broadly accurate.
15. This would not meet the 5m or 6m standards. The likelihood is that vehicles would be parked overhanging the public footway putting pedestrians in danger and/or there would be an increase in the number of vehicles parked on the road causing obstructions to the safe passage of other road users. Thus, the proposal does not make appropriate or deliverable car parking provision at the host property in accordance with adopted standards. This puts the scheme at odds with the parking provision requirements in LP Policy LP13.

Concluding comments

16. My findings on the main issues relating to the character and appearance of the surrounding area and car parking at the host property are decisive to the outcome of this appeal. There is conflict with the development plan. The harm cannot be mitigated by the imposition of planning conditions and it is not outweighed by other material considerations or by my findings on the main issue relating to the amenity of the occupants of 44 Oak Road.
17. For the reasons given above and taking into account all other matters raised, I conclude that this appeal should not succeed.

Andrew Dale

INSPECTOR