



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 September 2025

by **Paul Martinson BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 29 September 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/J0540/D/25/3369964

14 Five Arches, Orton Wistow, Peterborough PE2 6FG

- 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 Nicholas Groenewald against the decision of Peterborough City Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/00253/HHFUL.
 - The development proposed is described as: 'Erection of first floor front extension over existing garage and associated works'.
-

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 area.

Reasons

3. Five Arches is a suburban cul-de-sac comprising of predominantly two storey detached houses. Dwellings are aligned to the curvature of the road, being set back a reasonably consistent distance from the road edge with open front gardens and driveways. Garages are prominent features of the cul-de-sac and typically comprise of a single storey extension to the main two storey building, a separate detached single storey building or a garage integrated into the main building. The garages have characteristic hipped roofs and, those that are attached, often project out from the front elevations with garage doors to the side. Despite the prevalence of attached garages, two storey front projections are rare in the streetscene, which contributes to the open feel of the estate.
4. The appeal site is a detached two storey dwelling located close to a turning head. Its single storey garage projection lies perpendicular to its front elevation, as is characteristic here. Consistent with the character of the streetscene, the main part of the dwelling is set back from the garage and from the road edge. Its neighbour, No 15, is similarly aligned, although set slightly forward than the appeal property at first floor level.
5. Owing to the scale of the footprint of the garage, the proposed first floor extension would be of a significant scale, extending out a considerable distance beyond the existing first floor level and also that of the neighbouring property. This long, two storey projection would become a dominant and bulky addition that would reduce the open feel of the streetscene here. Whilst I appreciate there would be some screening provided by the existing built form of the neighbouring dwelling, this

element would still be visible along much of the length of this part of the cul-de-sac and would occupy a prominent position close to the edge of the turning head. On this basis, the proposal would represent an incongruous form of development that would be at odds with the prevailing character of the streetscene.

6. The appellant proposes matching materials and a slightly lower ridgeline. However, this would not prevent the proposal from appearing as a prominent first floor addition within the streetscene.
7. On my site visit I was able to view No 56 Five Arches, which has been extended similarly to the appeal proposal. However, I am not provided with any details of the circumstances that led to that addition being approved, which limits the weight I can give to this. Moreover, No 56 is located along another cul-de-sac in a different part of the estate. As such the appeal scheme would not be seen in the context of the extension at No 56. Furthermore, I would note that the main part of the dwelling of No 56 is set back from the road edge to a much greater extent than the appeal property, such that the first floor addition still does not project out beyond its immediate neighbour. I am therefore not convinced, on the evidence before me, that the development at No 56 represents a parallel with the appeal scheme.
8. For the reasons outlined above, the proposed extension would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area. The proposal would therefore conflict with Policy LP16 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019) and paragraph 135 of the National Planning Policy Framework which together seek to ensure new developments provide high standards of design, are visually attractive and are sympathetic to the character and appearance of the area.

Other Matters

9. I acknowledge the appellant's reasons for seeking to extend their home of a number of years and that the proposal would provide personal benefits in that respect. Nevertheless, I am not convinced that the appeal scheme is the only means of achieving such benefits.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Paul Martinson

INSPECTOR