



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 July 2025

by Chris Couper BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22 July 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/J0540/D/25/3367024

22 Thurning Avenue, Stanground, Peterborough PE2 8QW

- 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 K Talman against the decision of Peterborough City Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/00346/HHFUL.
 - The development proposed is described as a side and rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The host comprises an end of terrace two storey property, which sits on a corner plot at the junction with Bythorn Road. I observed on my visit that the area includes a mix of houses and bungalows, typically with gabled roofs, and which are set back from the highway behind gardens and driveways in fairly consistent building lines.
4. The proposed single storey side extension would be located on an open area of lawn to the side of No 22. Unlike the side extension on the opposite side of the junction at 24 Thurning Avenue, the proposal would be stepped well forward of the front faces of the bungalows on Bythorn Road. As a result, notwithstanding its limited height, it would be prominent in the streetscene, and it would conflict with the spatial pattern of development in the area.
5. The proposed extension would also project forward of the host's front face and would wrap around the building to the rear, thus giving it a considerable depth. Its depth, large footprint, and shallow pitched, hipped roof, would give the extension an incongruous elongated form, which would jar with the proportions and form of the host. There would also be an awkward junction on the side elevation where the extension's hipped roof would meet the host building part way down its flank wall, resulting in a rather incoherent appearance.
6. The overall result would be an incongruous design, which would contrast unfavourably with the host property, and which would appear overly dominant in the streetscene, where it would fail to reflect the style and siting of nearby properties.

7. The appellant has drawn my attention to other development in the area. However, the gabled extensions at 2 and 24 Thurning Avenue broadly reflect the form and proportions of their respective host, and the single storey side extension to a property further along Thurning Avenue is much more modest in scale compared to this scheme. Those examples do not therefore alter my conclusion regarding the harm that this proposal would cause.
8. Notwithstanding the proposed use of matching materials, for the above reasons, the scheme would significantly harm the character and appearance of the host property and the area. As a result, it would conflict with those parts of Peterborough Local Plan 2016 to 2036 (2019) Policy LP16 which set out the need to respect the context of the site and the surrounding area, having regard to matters including patterns of development, building form, size, scale and massing. It would also conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework (2024) requirement for good design which is sympathetic to local character, and which establishes or maintains a strong sense of place.
9. Having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is therefore dismissed.

Chris Couper

INSPECTOR