

Application Ref: 13/00652/OUT

Proposal: Construction of a 2 bedroom dwelling

Site: 95 Thorpe Road, Peterborough, PE3 6JQ,
Applicant: Mr Peter Maycock

Agent: Planning Places For People

Referred by: Cllr Arculus
Reason: The scheme warrants Committee scrutiny to establish whether the loss of garden is outweighed by the sites sustainable location.

Site visit: 12.06.2013

Case officer: Mr M A Thomson
Telephone No. 01733 453478
E-Mail: matt.thomson@peterborough.gov.uk

Recommendation: **REFUSE**

1 Description of the Site and Surroundings and Summary of the Proposal

Site Description

The application site is part of the rear garden associated with a two storey, predominantly unaltered Victorian villa. The house is identified as a locally listed building (WE15, under policy PP17 of the adopted Planning Policies DPD). The dwelling forms one of several dwellings of similar style and character and retains a number of architectural features that are important to the historic character of the area. The property has two off-street parking spaces to front. The rear garden slopes to south, falling to a watercourse, and is host to several species of trees, including a Horse Chestnut which is protected by a Tree Preservation Order.

The immediate area to the west of the application site is characterised by similarly sized, locally listed Victorian villas on large, linear plots which front Thorpe Road. Slightly further west are two modern stone dwellings which received planning permission in 2003. The gardens of these properties have a number of mature trees within them which collectively given them an almost rural character. To the east is Fairmead Way, an estate which received planning permission in the 1970's while to the south is Rivermead which is separated from the application site by a watercourse. There are more residential dwellings to the north.

Summary of the Proposal

The application seeks outline planning permission for a two bedroom dwelling with all matters reserved. To support the proposal indicative drawings have been submitted, which illustrate a two storey dwelling built into the slope, a detached garage and vehicular access to the side of 95 Thorpe Road.

Update

Further to receiving this application a number of trees have been trimmed/felled adjacent to the watercourse at the bottom of the application site. None of these were protected and so permission for the works was not required.

2 Planning History

08/00602/OUT – Erection of a bungalow – Application Refused (26.6.2008) and Dismissed at Appeal (13.01.2009). A copy of the Appeal decision is attached as Appendix A.

3 Planning Policy

Decisions must be taken in accordance with the development plan policies below, unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

National Planning Policy Framework (2012)

Section 6 - Backland Development

Inappropriate development of residential gardens where harm would be caused to the local area should be resisted.

Section 7 - Good Design

Development should add to the overall quality of the area; establish a strong sense of place; optimise the site potential; create and sustain an appropriate mix of uses; support local facilities and transport networks; respond to local character and history while not discouraging appropriate innovation; create safe and accessible environments which are visually attractive as a result of good architecture and appropriate landscaping. Planning permission should be refused for development of poor design.

Section 11 - Biodiversity

Development resulting in significant harm to biodiversity or in the loss of/deterioration of irreplaceable habitats should be refused if the impact cannot be adequately mitigated, or compensated. Proposals to conserve or enhance biodiversity should be permitted and opportunities to incorporate biodiversity into new development encouraged.

Development within or outside a Site of Special Scientific Interest or other specified sites should not normally be permitted where an adverse effect on the site's notified special interest features is likely. An exception should only be made where the benefits clearly outweigh the impacts.

The presumption in favour of sustainable development does not apply where development requiring Appropriate Assessment under the Birds or Habitats Directives is being considered or determined.

Section 12 - Conservation of Heritage Assets

Account should be taken of the desirability of sustaining/enhancing heritage assets; the positive contribution that they can make to sustainable communities including economic viability; and the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness. When considering the impact of a new development great weight should be given to the asset's conservation.

Planning permission should be refused for development which would lead to substantial harm to or total loss of significance unless this is necessary to achieve public benefits that outweigh the harm/loss. In such cases all reasonable steps should be taken to ensure the new development will proceed after the harm/ loss has occurred.

Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011)

CS02 - Spatial Strategy for the Location of Residential Development

Provision will be made for an additional 25 500 dwellings from April 2009 to March 2026 in strategic areas/allocations.

CS10 - Environment Capital

Development should make a clear contribution towards the Council's aspiration to become Environment Capital of the UK.

CS13 - Development Contributions to Infrastructure Provision

Contributions should be secured in accordance with the Planning Obligations Implementation Scheme SPD (POIS).

CS14 - Transport

Promotes a reduction in the need to travel, sustainable transport, the Council's UK Environment Capital aspirations and development which would improve the quality of environments for residents.

CS16 - Urban Design and the Public Realm

Design should be of high quality, appropriate to the site and area, improve the public realm, address vulnerability to crime, be accessible to all users and not result in any unacceptable impact upon the amenities of neighbouring residents.

CS17 - The Historic Environment

Development should protect, conserve and enhance the historic environment including non scheduled nationally important features and buildings of local importance.

CS20 - Landscape Character

New development should be sensitive to the open countryside. within the Landscape Character Areas development will only be permitted where specified criteria are met.

CS21 - Biodiversity and Geological Conservation

Development should conserve and enhance biodiversity/ geological interests unless no alternative sites are available and there are demonstrable reasons for the development.

CS22 - Flood Risk

Development in Flood Zones 2 and 3 will only be permitted if specific criteria are met. Sustainable drainage systems should be used where appropriate.

Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012)

PP01 - Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development

Applications which accord with policies in the Local Plan and other Development Plan Documents will be approved unless material considerations indicate otherwise. Where there are no relevant policies, the Council will grant permission unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

PP02 - Design Quality

Permission will only be granted for development which makes a positive contribution to the built and natural environment; does not have a detrimental effect on the character of the area; is sufficiently robust to withstand/adapt to climate change; and is designed for longevity.

PP03 - Impacts of New Development

Permission will not be granted for development which would result in an unacceptable loss of privacy, public and/or private green space or natural daylight; be overbearing or cause noise or other disturbance, odour or other pollution; fail to minimise opportunities for crime and disorder.

PP04 - Amenity Provision in New Residential Development

Proposals for new residential development should be designed and located to ensure that they provide for the needs of the future residents.

PP12 - The Transport Implications of Development

Permission will only be granted if appropriate provision has been made for safe access by all user groups and there would not be any unacceptable impact on the transportation network including

highway safety.

PP13 - Parking Standards

Permission will only be granted if appropriate parking provision for all modes of transport is made in accordance with standards.

PP16 - The Landscaping and Biodiversity Implications of Development

Permission will only be granted for development which makes provision for the retention of trees and natural features which contribute significantly to the local landscape or biodiversity.

PP17 - Heritage Assets

Development which would affect a heritage asset will be required to preserve and enhance the significance of the asset or its setting. Development which would have detrimental impact will be refused unless there are overriding public benefits.

4 Consultations/Representations

Wildlife Officer (22.05.13)

No objection - subject to conditions with respect to no works to hedgerows or trees during bird breeding season, conditioning lighting levels and biodiversity improvements, such as bat and bird boxes.

Conservation Officer (25.06.13)

Objects – The sub-division of the rear garden would erode the setting of the building.

Landscape Officer (15.05.13)

Objects - A Horse Chestnut covered by a Tree Preservation Order (TPO) and off-site Beech are mature trees which dominate the rear garden area. These are imposing in overall size and crown spread, which would overshadow the proposed dwelling and its dedicated amenity space. If consent was granted, future occupiers would place pressure on these trees for removal. These trees add to the green area which runs from Winchester Way, Riverside Gardens, Fairmead Way, Thorpe Road and Thorpe Meadows.

Archaeological Officer (14.05.13)

No objection

Building Control Surveyor (10.05.13)

No objection - to achieve a satisfactory fire service access the driveway should be constructed to support 12.5 tonnes and a turning area of adequate dimensions should be provided adjacent to the proposed dwelling.

Pollution Team

No comments received

Transport & Engineering Services (21.03.13)

No objection - subject to conditions being attached with respect to access, provision and retention of parking and turning, details of pedestrian visibility splays and temporary facilities for construction traffic.

Local Residents/Interested Parties

Initial consultations: 14

Total number of responses: 6

Total number of objections: 6

Total number in support: 0

6 letters of neighbour representation have been received. These raise the following concerns;

- A similar scheme was refused and dismissed at Appeal in 2008
- Wildlife impact and loss of natural habitat
- Future occupiers would place pressure on existing on and off site trees, and seek their felling, as the new build and garden would be in shade throughout the day
- The proposed access would generate noise by vehicle movements and harm neighbour amenity
- Visual impact
- Any landscaping and land profiling post construction would harm the appearance and character of the local environment
- The proposal does not make a positive contribution to the quality of the built environment
- The proposed elevated position and two balconies would result in unacceptably adverse levels of overlooking to properties on Riverside Gardens
- Glare and reflection from south facing windows
- Noise mitigation measures would not decrease noise levels
- Loss of garden
- No justification in support of harming the setting of a locally listed building
- No commitment to meeting Policy CS10 (Environmental Capital)
- Increased surface run-off
- Flats at 119 Thorpe Road face address the street scene and the Stone Houses have a frontage; these are not back land.
- Loss of light
- Highway safety
- Property prices
- Noise from construction

Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Regulations 2010

/ Planning Obligations

Requests for planning obligations whether CIL is in place or not are only lawful where they meet the following tests:-

- (a) necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms;
- (b) directly related to the development; and
- (c) fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development.

In addition obligations should be:

- (i) relevant to planning;
- (ii) reasonable in all other respects.

Planning permissions may not be bought or sold. Unacceptable development cannot be permitted because of benefits/inducements offered by a developer which are not necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms. Neither can obligations be used purely as a means of securing for the local community a share in the profits of development.

5 Assessment of the planning issues

1) History

An outline application was received in 2008 (App Ref: 08/00602/OUT) for the erection of a

- detached bungalow (4 bedrooms). The application was refused on the following grounds;
- Impact on the character and appearance of the area, including the loss of a number of hedge rows and high specimen trees
 - The proposed access would harm neighbour amenity by virtue of vehicle movements.
 - Excessive overshadowing of the proposed garden area and proposed dwelling given the development's orientation in relation to the path of the sun.
 - Failure to enter into a Section 106 agreement.

The decision was appealed and the appeal dismissed by the Planning Inspectorate (App Ref: 2080100/WF), thereby upholding the Local Planning Authority's decision. Whilst acknowledging that the site is in a sustainable location, the Inspector concluded that this did not outweigh the negative aspects of the scheme in terms of harm to the character and appearance of the area, the probable harm to the living conditions of the occupiers of the proposed dwelling and lack of information on ecology. He did not accept, as a reason for dismissing the appeal, the Council's concerns about harm to neighbour amenity as a result of vehicle movements.

2) Principle of Development

Policy CS2 of the Peterborough Core Strategy sets out that new development should be located in and around the urban area of the city to create a strong and sustainable community, making the most of previously developed land and enabling better access to existing services and facilities. The application site is located within the urban area and therefore potentially in a sustainable location for a new dwelling. However, it is a residential garden which does not benefit from direct vehicular access. The proposal is, therefore, considered to be backland development. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) sets out that Local Planning Authorities should consider policies which resist inappropriate development of residential gardens where harm would be caused to the local area. Policy PP2 of the Planning Policies DPD sets out that development will be supported where it makes a positive contribution to the quality of the natural and built environment and where it would not have a detrimental effect on the character of any immediate adjoining properties or the surrounding area.

As set out under section 1 above the application site and the neighbouring gardens to the west have a very strong and distinct character of long spacious gardens with mature trees. Although the stone dwellings consented in 2003 are set slightly further back from Thorpe Road they are not considered to be backland development. The application site relates more closely in its character to these properties to the west than it does to the dwellings to the east. It is considered that the introduction of dwellings in the rear gardens of these properties would erode the distinct character of this area, thereby having a detrimental impact, particularly in light of the impact which the development would have on a building of local importance and the existing trees. These impacts are set out in the sections below. As such the proposal is considered to be contrary to policy PP2 of the adopted Planning Policies DPD.

3) Design, Layout and Impact on Heritage Assets

To facilitate the proposed vehicular access an existing porch on the side of No 95 Thorpe Road would be demolished. The porch is of no architectural merit and its loss is accepted.

No 95 Thorpe Road is a Locally Listed Building as identified by Policy PP17 of the Peterborough Policies DPD (2012). As such any proposal should not have an unacceptable adverse impact on its setting, unless it is otherwise justified. The supporting documentation sets out that the proposed dwelling would be occupied by the applicant's parents.

It is considered that the proposal would be harmful to the setting of a Locally Listed Building as it would result in backland development which reduces the extent of its garden area and which would erode the semi-rural character of the immediate area which the site and the adjoining properties collectively form. The justification for the proposal is not considered to outweigh the harm to the setting of this building.

The indicative drawings illustrate a dwelling which would be constructed over two floors with a

mono pitch roof and detached double garage. Whilst a topographical survey has not been submitted, the indicative sections illustrate the proposal would be dug into the garden to take account of the change in levels. The indicative design of the dwelling is considered to be innovative and it does make the most of the falling site levels. However, it is not considered that a modern, innovative design would outweigh the harm which would be caused to the setting of this Locally Listed Building and established semi-rural and tranquil character of the area. As such the proposal is considered to be contrary to policies CS16 and CS17 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011), the NPPF (2012) and PP2 and PP17 of the Peterborough Policies DPD (2012).

4) Access and Parking

This is an outline application with all matters reserved; however details of the proposed access from Thorpe Road have been shown on the submitted plans. The indicative plans show a two bedroomed dwelling with detached double garage. Building Control has advised that the access will need to support a 12.5 ton vehicle and provide a turning area to provide fire service access. A letter of representation has raised concern with issues of highway safety, however the Local Highway Authority (LHA) has not objected to the proposal. It has requested conditions in respect of access, provision and retention of parking and turning, details of pedestrian visibility splays and temporary facilities for construction traffic.

The site would be capable of providing three off-street parking spaces and the access would not result in a highway safety hazard, as such the proposal would accord with Policy CS14 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011) and PP12 and PP13 of the Peterborough Policies DPD (2012).

5) Trees and Amenity of Future Occupiers

The Landscape Officer has objected to the proposal, advising that the Horse Chestnut which is protected by a Tree Preservation Order (TPO) and off-site Beech tree are mature species which dominate the application site. They are imposing in their overall size and crown spread, and would overshadow the proposed dwelling and its dedicated amenity space. The trees at the south of the site have been thinned and felled to open up the lower part of the site; this supports the Inspector's previous comments and reasons for dismissal, which stated future occupiers would place undue pressure on felling these trees to provide suitable levels of natural sunlight.

The topography of the land drops sharply from Thorpe Road to the watercourse adjacent to Rivermead. The indicative layout illustrates a dwelling which would be built into the slope therefore the area of land to south would in fact be a steep slope. In the absence of a topographical survey it is not possible to establish whether the proposed garden space would be useable. Further, given the proximity of the protected Horse Chestnut tree and off-site trees, the majority of the garden area would be overshadowed. As such there is little scope to relocate the dwelling within the plot to a location where it would not be overshadowed. Given this it is considered that the future occupiers of the dwelling would place pressure on these trees to be felled as they would cause overshadowing to the principal windows serving the proposed dwelling and useable primary amenity space.

To facilitate access to the site the submitted layout indicates that a Holly Tree (Grade B) would be felled and that it would be located within 1m of a Sycamore (Grade A). The submitted information indicates that there would be no dig construction around the tree but there are no details of existing and proposed site levels and construction details for the proposed access. As such it is considered that the access could have an unacceptable adverse impact on the future health of the Grade A tree. Category A trees are classed as those of a high quality and amenity value. Category B trees are classed as being of moderate quality and amenity value. Category A and B trees should be considered a constraint to development and their retention should be sought unless their loss can be justified. No justification has been provided and given the site constraints is it not considered that an alternate access point or access width could be provided which would not result in an unacceptably adverse impact on these trees.

In light of the above, the proposal is considered to be contrary to policies CS16 and CS20 of the

Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011) and policies PP4 and PP16 of the Peterborough Policies DPD (2012).

6) Impact on Neighbour Amenity

Whilst the drawings are indicative, it is anticipated that the dwelling would be two storey, built into the slope and that there would be no north, west or east facing windows (this could be conditioned if the principle of development is otherwise considered to be acceptable). In the absence of a topographical survey it is not possible to fully assess neighbour impact; however the raised platforms appear to form the primary amenity space for future occupiers. It is considered that they would, even with the separation distance (some 50 metres), give unrestricted views of properties at Rivermead especially as the trees to the south of the site have been thinned and felled. There are also concerns about overlooking of properties to the east from the raised platforms. Given the site constraints it is not considered that an alternate layout or on-site mitigation could be provided which would overcome these issues.

Issues relating to the noise and disturbance to neighbours generated by the proposed vehicular access were not previously deemed to be contentious by the Planning Inspector, despite being a reason for the Local Planning Authority's refusal of the application. Whilst the Local Planning Authority continues to have concerns about the potential impact on amenity from the new access in light of the Inspectors decision, it is not considered that the current application could be resisted on this basis.

Issues of glare/reflection, the visual impact and loss of daylight have also been raised. In the absence of detailed level information it is not currently possible to assess whether the proposal is likely to result in glare/reflection although it is considered unlikely. The fact that the dwelling maybe seen from neighbouring plots does not in itself make it unacceptable, unless there would be an associated adverse impact on amenity in terms of factors such as overlooking, loss of daylight etc. Whilst indicative, given the height and juxtaposition of the development it is not considered that the proposal would result in an unacceptably adverse loss of light to neighbour amenity.

The representations received have raised concerns with respect to noise and disruption generated by construction traffic. Should planning permission be granted a Construction Management Plan could be secured by a condition. Whilst there maybe some disturbance during the construction period this is not a reason to refuse planning permission.

In light of the removal of trees to the south of the site there are concerns about the potential for overlooking of properties at Rivermead. It is not considered that the dwelling could be relocated or designed in such a way as to achieve an acceptable relocation to these properties. Any proposal which included raised platforms also has the potential to adversely impact on the privacy of dwellings to the east. As such the proposal is considered to be contrary to policy CS16 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011) and PP3 of the Peterborough Policies DPD (2012).

7) Biodiversity & Wildlife

The Wildlife Officer has raised no objection to the proposal subject to conditions with respect to limiting external lighting, opportunities for on-site biodiversity enhancement, such as installing bird and bat boxes, and no hedgerow removal during bird breeding season. Subject to these conditions the proposal would accord with the NPPF (2012) and Policy PP16 of the Peterborough Policies DPD (2012).

8) Flood Risk

The application site is located in an area with a low likelihood of flooding, albeit that the southern most part of the site it is adjacent to a water course. Whilst a detailed topographical survey has not been submitted it is anticipated the change in levels is in the region of 7 to 10 metres. Drainage details could be secured by a condition should planning permission be granted. Subject to these details being secured the proposal would not result in a flood risk hazard and would accord with Policy CS22 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011).

9) Archaeology

The Council's Archaeologist has advised that the proposal is unlikely to affect undiscovered archaeology and therefore would accord with policy CS17 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011) and PP17 of the Peterborough Policies DPD (2012).

10) Environmental Capital

In order to accord with policy CS10 of the adopted Core Strategy which seeks to secure a contribution towards Peterborough's objective of becoming an Environment Capital of the UK. If planning permission is granted it is recommended that a condition be imposed requiring the development to be constructed so that it achieves a Target Emission Ratio of at least 10% better than the Building Regulations in force at the time building regulation approval is sought. Subject to this it will therefore accord with policy CS10 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011).

11) Contamination

The application site is not believed to be at risk from contamination given it has been used historically as garden land, however should planning permission be granted a condition should be attached in the event of discovering undiscovered contamination. Subject to a condition being attached the proposal would accord with the NPPF (2012) and PP20 of the Peterborough Policies DPD (2012).

12) Section 106 Legal Agreement

The Planning Obligations and Implementations Scheme (POIS) SPG (2010) seeks a contribution of £6,000 and a 2% Monitoring Fee of £120. A Section 106 Agreement has not been entered into therefore the proposal does not accord with Policy CS13 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011).

Other Issues

Concerns have been raised regarding the impact of the development on property prices; this is not a material planning consideration therefore cannot be taken into account.

6 Conclusions

The area is traditionally characterised by large properties in spacious plots. The proposed development would constitute backland development and would result in significant and unacceptably adverse harm to the setting of a Locally Listed Building and would erode the established character and appearance of the area.

A topographical survey has not been submitted therefore it is not possible to establish the amount of useable garden which would serve the new dwelling. The indicative drawings indicate two raised platforms which would become the primary amenity space for the proposal; given that the trees at the south of the site have been felled this would result in an unacceptably adverse loss of privacy and amenity to adjacent occupiers.

Notwithstanding the fact that the trees at the south have been felled, the application site would be overshadowed by on-site and off-site trees, one of which is subject to a Tree Preservation Order. Therefore any principal windows and the primary amenity space would be overshadowed throughout the day. As such future occupiers would place undue pressure on these trees to be felled. Further, the proposed access would result in the loss of a Grade B Holly tree and place unknown pressure on a Grade A Sycamore.

Finally, a S106 Agreement has not been entered into; therefore it has not been possible to secure essential infrastructure improvements.

Whilst the submitted drawings are indicative only, given the constraints of the application site it is not considered that the Planning Inspectorates' reasons for refusing the previous application have been overcome. The removal of the trees along the southern boundary has changed the relationship between the site and the properties to the south from that considered previously to be

acceptable and is considered to create a new concern. Further, the scheme has not demonstrated that it can provide a turning area for a fire vehicle.

There have been no changes in planning policy which would now make the scheme acceptable.

The proposal is therefore unacceptable having been assessed in light of all material considerations, including weighing against relevant policies of the development plan and for the specific reasons given below.

7 Recommendation

The Head of Planning, Transport and Engineering Services recommends that planning permission is **REFUSED**

- R 1 The wooded garden of number 95 relates closely with the mature gardens to the west which creates an attractive feature within what is otherwise a high density urban area. Whilst it is noted that there are properties to the east of the site it is considered that the nature and character of the application plot relates more closely to the dwellings to the west. The introduction of a dwelling within the attractive mature open garden would be out of keeping with the mature wooded area created by the application plot and the plots to the west which would in-turn harm its character and appearance. In addition the proposal would require the removal of a number of specimen trees and to make way for the access which would further erode its character. The proposal is therefore contrary to policies CS16 and CS20 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011), Paragraph 53 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2012) and PP2 of the Peterborough Policies DPD (2012).
- R2 No. 95 Thorpe Road is a locally listed building (WE15) that forms one of seven Victorian villa's which have been identified for their architectural design, their contribution to the street scene and are served by large, linear rear gardens with mature planting. The proposed dwelling would be located within the rear garden of a locally listed building; by creating a separate plot and vehicular access this would significantly reduce the amount of garden space No. 95 Thorpe Road has enjoyed since it was originally built thereby causing significant harm to the character and setting of this locally listed building. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy CS17 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011), Paragraphs 53 and 135 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2012) and PP17 of the Peterborough Policies DPD (2012).
- R 3 The large mature horse chestnut tree, which is protected by a Tree Preservation Order, would cause excessive overshadowing to the proposed garden area given its orientation in relation to the path of the sun. Further, a mature Beech tree which is located within the curtilage of 97 Thorpe Road would also overshadow the proposed dwelling and associated amenity space. It is therefore considered that the proposed garden would not provide for a sufficient level or quality of private amenity space to the occupants of the proposed dwelling. Furthermore this is likely to result in pressure from future occupants for extensive works to the tree which is likely to harm its health and appearance. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy CS20 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011) and Policies PP4 and PP16 of the Peterborough Policies DPD (2012).
- R4 The indicative drawings would create two raised platforms which, when considering the change in site levels, would form part of the proposed dwellings primary amenity space. Further to the felling and reduction to a number of trees at the south of the site and the fact that these raised platforms would be located at a higher level than neighbours to the south, from their elevated position future occupiers would be able to look directly in the rear gardens of No's 6 and 7 Rivermead. The proposal would therefore form an unacceptably adverse impact of overlooking and loss of privacy to these properties. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy CS16 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011) and PP3 of the Peterborough Policies DPD (2012).

R 5 The provision of the service and infrastructure requirements which will arise as a consequence of the development has not been secured. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy CS13 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011).

Appendix A

Planning Appeal Decision - A/08/2080100/WF – Outline application for the Erection of Bungalow.

Copy to Councillors Arculus, Dalton, Maqbool

This page is intentionally left blank