

Appendix A – Appeals Performance from 01.01.2016 to 31.08.2016

Application reference	Address	Proposal	Officer Recommendation	Committee Decision / Date	Reasons for Refusal	Appeal Procedure	Appeal Decision / Date	Costs Decision	Inspector's Reasons
15/00369/OUT	Land To The East Of Woolfellhill Rd Eye Peterborough	Development of Agricultural Land to provide a Eco Community of Eleven Self-sufficient dwellings	Refusal	N/A	<p>1.Site lies outside settlement boundary and is open countryside. Proposal would not be of exceptional quality or innovative design – contrary to CS1, SA4 and paragraph 55 of NPPF.</p> <p>2.Substandard access in terms of width, posing a highway safety danger – contrary to PP12.</p> <p>3.Insufficient evidence to demonstrate no harm to likely buried archaeology – contrary to CS17 and Section 12 of NPPF.</p> <p>4.Failed to pass flood risk Sequential Test – contrary to CS22 and Section 10 of NPPF.</p>	Written Representations	Dismissed 05.09.2016	N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Site is set apart from the settlement and is somewhat out on a limb in relation to the main built-up area. Pedestrian access would not be safe and therefore residents would have reservations in using it. Proposal would offer limited contribution to enhancing or maintaining the vitality of the rural community. - Development would appear an intrusion into and detract from the open rural character of the area. - Proposal's design principles, energy saving features and use of materials are well established and not convinced that the scheme would be particularly unique or unusual in this regard. Proposal would therefore not meet the special circumstance set out in paragraph 55 of NPPF. - Insufficient evidence for confident assessment of the archaeological potential of the site. As such, cannot be satisfied that no harm to archaeological remains would result. - Have seen nothing to suggest that satisfactory access to the site could not be achieved through appropriate conditions. - Majority of the site is within Flood Zone 1. There is no reason why it would not be possible to accommodate the proposed dwellings wholly within this area.
16/00417/HHFUL	10 Soke Road Newborough Peterborough PE6 7QT	Detached garage to front of property - resubmission	Refusal	N/A	<p>1.Garage would site to the front of the property and occupy a prominent position, resulting in a structure that would be very visible in the streetscene. Out of keeping with established built form – contrary to CS16 and PP2.</p>	Householder Appeals Service (HAS)	Dismissed 05.09.2016	N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Quite substantial garage, situated in a prominent location, would detract visually from the spacious character of the street. Harm caused would not be considerable, but would be significant and this is sufficient to not comply with CS16 and PP2.
15/02218/OUT	202 Thorpe Rd Peterborough PE3 6LB	Erection of a detached 2/3 bedroom bungalow with associated car parking and amenity space	Refusal	N/A	<p>1.Proposal represents backland development in an area characterised by Arcadian landscape, comprising low density development. Would be inconsistent with the established layout and at odds with principles for which the area was designated a Special Character Area – contrary to SA19 and PP17.</p>	Written Representations	Dismissed 29.09.2016	N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Special Character Area (SCA) characterised by low-density, large detached houses set in spacious, well-landscaped gardens. Accept that proposal could physically be comfortably accommodated within the site, however it would nonetheless alter the character of the area. Proposal would be significantly out-of-keeping with the form of development in the SCA and would

Appendix A – Appeals Performance from 01.01.2016 to 31.08.2016

					2. Garden size would be unacceptable reduced, at odds with the character of the site and its surroundings – contrary to CS16.				represent a harmful erosion of the special character which would make future proposals hard to resist.
16/00270/OUT	31 Westhawe Bretton Peterborough PE3 8BA	Construction of a single residential dwelling	Refusal	N/A	<p>1. Unacceptable harm to the general character of the area – contrary to CS16, PP2 and Section 6 of NPPF.</p> <p>2. Unacceptable harm to the amenities of neighbouring occupants in terms of overbearing impact – contrary to CS16 and PP3.</p> <p>3. Proposal poses unacceptable risk to adjacent Mucklands Wood County Wildlife Site ancient woodland – contrary to PP16, PP18 and Section 11 of NPPF.</p> <p>4. Unacceptable level of amenity would be afforded to future occupiers owing to lack of private amenity space and relationship to adjacent woodland – contrary to PP4.</p> <p>5. Proposed access would offer unacceptable pedestrian visibility – contrary to CS14 and PP12.</p> <p>6. Insufficient access width posing a danger to highway safety – contrary to CS14 and PP12.</p> <p>7. Insufficient turning would be provided within the site, leading to vehicles reversing onto the highway – contrary to CS14 and PP12.</p>	Written Representations	Dismissed 30.09.2016	N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The area is of unique design, with an attractive, spacious character. A dwelling sited in the rear garden would result in a cramped and incongruous form of backland development, starkly at odds with the pattern provided by existing frontage housing. - Whilst the reserved matters could minimise any overbearing or loss of privacy, this would not be sufficient to reduce the harmful impact on the outlook from the immediate neighbour. Proposal would also detract from the level of quietude and seclusion offered by the neighbouring back garden at present. - Not persuaded that an additional dwelling would materially harm the potential management of this part of the County Wildlife Site as ancient woodland. - Not persuaded that the proposed access would materially harm the safety of pedestrians, cyclists and drivers using the cul-de-sac.
16/01249/HHFUL	30 Thorpe Park Road Peterborough PE3 6LG	External wall insulation with red brick effect render to front elevation	Refusal	N/A	1. Proposed red brick effect render would be visually inappropriate and out of keeping with the properties along the streetscene – contrary CS16 and PP2.	Householder Appeals Services (HAS)	Allowed 04.11.2016	N/A	- Thorpe Park Road exhibit a variety of forms, styles and material finishes, therefore unable to discern an underlying built pattern or common finish. The eastern elevation has been completed (under a previous permission) and part is visible from the streetscene. The colour proposed would be more uniform than that of the nearby brickwork however other properties have been painted a similar colour to that proposed. Furthermore, the front boundary wall provides some screening. The proposed cladding would not be detrimental to the property or surrounding streetscene.