



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 September 2025

by **D Cleary MTCP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 08 October 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/J0540/D/25/3371025

2 Cowper Road, New England, Peterborough PE1 3JX

- 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 DC Singh against the decision of Peterborough City Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/00620/HHFUL.
 - The development proposed is described as a two storey side and rear extension with single storey front porch extension with alterations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. In the banner above, I have taken the description of development from the decision notice of the Council rather than the application form. This is because it more accurately describes the development by removing wording which is not an act of development.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are the effect of the development on:
 - a) the character and appearance of the existing building and surrounding area; and,
 - b) the living conditions of the occupiers of nearby properties with particular regard to overbearing.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. The appeal dwelling is a two-storey detached building with brick elevations and tiled hipped roof. The dwelling has an existing single storey projection to the rear and a detached outbuilding located to the rear of the plot. The dwelling is set back from the street behind a parking area to the front. The dwelling sits within an L-shaped plot with a staggered boundary to one side. Cowper Road is a residential street which includes dwellings which are varied in design and form. As such the street does not have a strong sense of uniformity. The dwellings on Cowper Road which lie adjacent to the appeal site are closely spaced. No.1 Cowper Road (No.1) is positioned opposite the appeal dwelling. This is a detached property which is positioned slightly closer to the junction with St Paul's Road than the appeal

dwelling. No.1 has a blank side gable elevation which is prominent within the street. Both the appeal dwelling and No.1 are positioned to the rear of the lengthy gardens of dwellings on St Paul's Road. As such, they are positioned some distance from the junction of St Paul's Road and Cowper Road.

5. The appeal scheme includes two-storey extensions to both the side and rear. The extensions to the side would initially match the existing dwelling in terms of building line and the eaves/ridge heights. The extension would then step back from the front elevation and would include a lowered ridge height. The set back and step down are of sufficient distances to clearly distinguish that part of the extension. The two-storey rear extension would have a ridge height which would be set down even further. While I accept that cumulatively the extensions would result in a significant increase in the scale of the property, the set back and step down of ridge heights to parts of the extensions would introduce a sense of visual hierarchy to the extended dwelling. These measures would ensure that appropriate subservience to the original dwelling would be provided.
6. The extension to the side would consume much of the width of the plot, although it would be set in slightly from the side boundary. Notwithstanding this, dwellings along this part of Cowper Road are generally closely spaced with small gaps retained between the dwellings and their side boundaries. The proposed dwelling as extended would be similar to this established arrangement. Furthermore, the significant spacing between the appeal property and the buildings on St Paul's Road would ensure that the site would not appear overdeveloped or cramped. Therefore, I do not consider that the coverage of the plot width to be out of character with the area.
7. The site is positioned some distance from St Pauls Road, and contrary to the suggestion of the Council, I do not consider this to be a corner plot. The extensions would represent large additions, and the flank elevation of both the side and rear extensions would be visible from Cowper Road. However, this part of the street is characterised by the flank elevations of the appeal dwelling and No.1 being prominent in views along the street. The proposed extensions would not deviate significantly from this existing arrangement. Furthermore, the extensions would not result in the development which encroaches significantly towards St Pauls Road, and would remain comparative to the position of No.1 on the opposite side of the street. Therefore, the existing visual relationship along the street would not be unduly eroded. In addition, the street is not one of uniformity meaning that the street could visually accommodate extensions of this scale and nature without appearing out of context.
8. For the above reasons, the development would not have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the existing building and surrounding area. The development therefore complies with Policy L16 of the Peterborough Local Plan 2016 to 2036 (the PLP). This, amongst other things, requires that development contributes positively to the character and local distinctiveness of the area.

Living Conditions

9. With regard to the relationship with No.4 Cowper Road (No.4), the proposed rear extension would be positioned on the far side of an existing single storey rear extension which would be partially retained. Consequently, the proposed rear

extension would be set away from the side boundary with No.4 by some distance. While the extension would be located in a southerly position in relation to No.4, the off-set would be sufficient to ensure that any overshadowing to the garden space or loss of light to internal rooms would be limited. Similarly, whilst the extensions would be visible from both internal and external spaces of No.4, the off-set would be sufficient to ensure that adverse overbearing effects would not arise.

10. Both No.200 and No.202 St Paul's Road (No.200 and No.202) have rear facing windows which would look towards the proposed extension. However, these dwellings also benefit from lengthy rear gardens. Consequently, the development would be set some distance from the rear elevations of both No.200 and No.202. While I note that there are no adopted spacing standards for the area, the separation distances would be significant and sufficient to ensure that there would be no adverse loss of outlook or overshadowing to windows within those properties.
11. Notwithstanding the above, the proposed two storey extensions to the side and rear would be positioned very close to the rear boundaries of both No.200 and No.202. The height of the extensions would project significantly above the boundary fences and the absence of any meaningful spacing from the boundaries means that there would be limited visual relief. Together the height of the development and its close proximity to the boundaries would result in a considerable expanse and mass of built form which would loom over the rear garden spaces of these properties. From these closest garden spaces the extension would appear as an overbearing and oppressive building. The effect on No.202 would be further exacerbated as the development would be positioned against both its rear and side boundaries, thereby partially enclosing the rearmost area of the garden with two-storey development. The development would have a domineering presence from within this area.
12. I accept that the areas of garden which would be affected are some distance from the respective dwellings. However, the spaces are maintained as garden and are useable, while an outbuilding is also positioned to the rear of No.202. There is no evidence to suggest that these are garden spaces which are of limited value which the occupants of the dwellings do not rely on or enjoy. Even if I did find these areas to be less sensitive or important, the imposing scale and close proximity of the development to these areas is such that the overbearing effects would remain significantly harmful and unneighbourly. Furthermore, a first-floor bedroom window would be positioned in the rear elevation of the side extension. This would be positioned very close to the garden space of No.202. This would have direct views into the garden resulting in overlooking into this area. This is a further intrusive element arising from the development.
13. For the above reasons, the development would have an unacceptably harmful effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring properties with particular regard to overbearing. The development therefore conflicts with Policy L17 of the PLP. This requires that development should not result in an unacceptable impact on the amenity of existing occupiers of nearby properties, including through overbearing.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons given above the appeal should be dismissed.

D Cleary

INSPECTOR