

**Appendix 1 – Appeals Performance from 01.12.2016 to 28.02.2017**

Application reference	Address	Proposal	Officer Recommendation	Committee Decision / Date	Reasons for Refusal	Appeal Procedure	Appeal Decision / Date	Costs Decision	Inspector's Reasons
16/00348/FUL	Lazyacre Werrington Bridge Road Milking Nook Peterborough PE6 7QF	Proposed day room	Refusal	N/A	1. Size, layout and design of the day room would be tantamount to a permanent dwelling. Building would be visible from outside the site and represent an intrusive feature in the open countryside – contrary to CS9 and CS20	Written Representations	Dismissed 31.01.2017	N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Building would be a substantial and significant structure that would have the appearance of a bungalow. It would be visible from outside the site and a further incursion of built form into the relatively flat rural landscape. This would erode and harm, the character and appearance of the countryside.</li> <li>- The personal circumstances of the Applicant are not considered sufficient to outweigh the harm identified.</li> </ul>
16/00260/FUL	1A Brassey Close New England Peterborough PE1 2AZ	30 bedroom student accommodation, creation of 19 x parking spaces & all associated works - Re-submission	Refusal	N/A	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Layout, scale and mass of development would be tantamount to 10 separate dwellings which would appear cramped and contrived, constituting overdevelopment – contrary to CS16 and PP2.</li> <li>2. Unacceptable level of amenity for future occupiers owing to lack of outdoor space and overshadowing by trees – contrary to PP4.</li> <li>3. Unacceptable overbearing impact to existing residents – contrary to PP3.</li> <li>4. Substandard vehicular access due to insufficient visibility splays – contrary to CS14 and PP12.</li> <li>5. Insufficient parking provision – contrary to PP13.</li> <li>6. Insufficient cycle parking provision – contrary to PP13.</li> <li>7. Harm to trees of key amenity value in the area – contrary to PP16.</li> </ol>	Written Representations	Dismissed 16.12.2016	N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Although proposal is for student accommodation, it would take the form of 10 no. dwellings. Appellant has offered little supporting evidence to demonstrate that student accommodation is required in the area. Therefore not satisfied that the buildings would be used for student accommodation. Because of this, proposal would appear cramped and out of keeping with the character of the area.</li> <li>- Existing access to the site is narrow and the proposal would lead to a considerable increase in traffic movement to/from the site. The access is wholly inadequate and would pose a danger to highway safety. In addition, parking would be insufficient to meet the needs of the development.</li> <li>- Satisfied that the distance to existing properties would be sufficient and would not significantly harm occupant amenity.</li> </ul>
15/01256/OUT	34 Uffington Road Barnack Stamford PE9 3DU	New three bed detached house in rear garden	Refusal	N/A	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Site is in a prominent location adjacent to the village boundary. Proposed curtilage is uncharacteristically small and dwelling would result in incongruous, isolated development at odds with the character of the area – contrary to CS16, PP2 and Design &amp; Development in Selected Villages SPD.</li> <li>2. Proposal has no connection with existing made-up road, meaning safe and convenient access cannot be provided – contrary to CS14 and PP12.</li> </ol>	Written Representations	Dismissed 31.01.2017	N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Little evidence presented as to how the dwelling would be accessed. Whilst this would be a reserved matter, without sufficient evidence, unable to conclude that the dwelling would be safely accessed.</li> <li>- Whilst linear form of development is noted, backland development has already taken place. Proposal would not be readily visible, with only glimpsed views possible. As such, the character and appearance of the village would not be significantly harmed.</li> </ul>

**Appendix 1 – Appeals Performance from 01.12.2016 to 28.02.2017**

16/01219/HHFUL	27 - 29 Dogsthorpe Road Peterborough PE1 3AD	Detached annex to the rear	Refusal	N/A	1.Size, scale and siting of proposal in conjunction with existing development on the site, would represent a cramped form of development which harms the character of the locality – contrary to CS16 and PP2. 2.Proposal would infill almost the entire outdoor amenity area which would leave both dwellings with insufficient garden space – contrary to PP4.	Written Representations	Dismissed 31.01.2017	N/A	- Although surrounding area is not entirely residential, and site is set against a backdrop of larger structures, the absence of relief from the built form would appear incongruously cramped and intensive. This would harm the character of the area. - The building would occupy almost all of the remaining garden space to the dwellings which fail to provide occupants with a well-designed and private amenity space commensurate with the scale of development.
15/01837/FUL	20 Crown Street New England Peterborough PE1 3HY	Change of use from tyre fitting centre to car wash	Refusal	N/A	1.Intensification of number of vehicles using a substandard access (width) which would pose a danger to highway safety – contrary to CS14 and PP12. 2.Increase in vehicular traffic adjacent to a residential dwelling which will give rise to unacceptable noise and disturbance to occupants – contrary to PP3.	Written Representations	Dismissed 31.01.2017	N/A	- Given the close proximity for the neighbouring dwelling to the access, occupants would be very aware of increased traffic movements due to noise/general disturbance. This would harm their amenity. - Proposal would impede the free flow of traffic on the highway as cars would be unable to pass one another. This would pose a safety risk.
16/00841/HHFUL And 16/00878/LBC	14 Maxey Road Helpston Peterborough PE6 7DP	Alterations and extension	Refusal	N/A	1.Extension is not sufficient subservient and would become a dominant feature to the Grade II Listed Building – contrary to Section 66(1) of Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas Act, CS17, PP2, PP17 and NPPF.	Written Representations	Dismissed 09.02.2017	N/A	- Given the small plot size, the extension would lead to a cramped, overdevelopment of the site. This would erode the historical architectural features of the rear building elevation. No harm would result to the Conservation Area but harm would result to the special interest of the listed building.
16/00718/LBC And 16/00717/HFUL	14 Maxey Road Helpston Peterborough PE6 7DP	Formation of two rear facing thatched eyebrow windows	Refusal	N/A	1.Proposed dormers are oversized and not characteristic of historic thatched cottages in the area, harming character and appearance of the Listed Building - contrary to Section 66(1) of Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas Act, Cs17, PP2, PP17 and NPPF.	Written Representations	Dismissed 09.02.2017	N/A	- The proposed dormers would introduce an architecturally inconsistent feature that would compromise the historic legibility of the building.
16/00262/FUL	1371 Lincoln Road Peterborough PE4 6LT	Proposed 2 bed bungalow	Refusal	N/A	1.Proposed dwelling would not confirm with the built form of its surroundings and would appear incongruous within the streetscene. It would erode an important green buffer between the two residential areas – contrary to CS16 and PP2.	Written Representations	Dismissed 07.02.2017	N/A	- Even though the proposed dwelling would be similar in appearance to the other dwellings nearby and positioned roughly in line with No 2 Salisbury Road, the proposal would introduce a significant bulk of development at the entrance to Salisbury Road. This would be harmful to the overall character and appearance of the area.

**Appendix 1 – Appeals Performance from 01.12.2016 to 28.02.2017**

16/01684/ADV	Land To North Of 57 Priestgate Bourges Boulevard Peterborough	Freestanding double sided LED digital advertisement display	Refusal	N/A	<p>1. Advertisement will harm the significance of the City Centre Conservation Area due to its size, scale, design, siting, materials, illumination and changing imagery – contrary to CS17 and PP17.</p> <p>2. Advertisement will be incongruous to the visual amenity of the general streetscene – contrary to CS16 and PP2.</p> <p>3. Advertisement would cause a danger to users of the public highway through distraction – contrary to CS14 and PP12.</p>	Fast Track Appeal	Dismissed 17.02.2017	N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Owing to the changing imagery, size and location of the advert, it would necessitate prolonged or multiple views. This would increase the likelihood of collisions at the roundabout and would pose an unacceptable danger to safety.</li> <li>- The site does not form a significant element of the setting of the Conservation Area and its special character is not experienced in close proximity to the site. Therefore, no unacceptable harm would result to its setting.</li> <li>- However, the advertisement would be garish and excessive which would give rise to significant harm to the character and appearance of the area.</li> </ul>
--------------	---	---	---------	-----	---	-------------------	----------------------	-----	--

This page is intentionally left blank