

Appendix 1 – Appeals Performance from 01.01.2022 – 31.03.2022

Application reference	Address	Proposal	Officer Recommendation	Committee Decision / Date	Reasons for Refusal	Appeal Procedure	Appeal Decision / Date	Costs Decision	Inspector's Reasons
20/01070/FUL	35 Westgate Peterborough PE1 1PZ	Subdivision of ground floor retail shop and associated alterations to form 6x Class E(a) retail units and taxi cab office (sui generis), change of use of second floor to restaurant (Class E(b)) and associated external alterations	Permitted	29.06.2021	1. Proposal would bring additional people into the area late at night, and would result in the potential for crime and anti-social behaviour – contrary to LP16.	Written Representations	Allowed 09.02.2022	Refused	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The taxi cab office would result in some customers being in the area late at night which has the potential to generate anti-social behaviour issues. - However, the Police and Architectural Liaison Officer raises no objection to the proposal (subject to a condition requiring various security measures). - A two-year temporary permission is proposed which would enable the anti-social behaviour situation to be reviewed at the end of that time.
21/00368/HHFUL	44 Church Street Werrington Peterborough PE4 6QE	Replacement of existing wooden front door to solidor composite door	Refusal	N/A	1. The proposed composite door would not be reflective of the traditional character of the property and would detract from the character and appearance of the building – contrary to LP16, LP19 and paragraphs 130 and 197 of NPPF.	Householder Appeals Service	Dismissed 08.03.2022	N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The proposed new front door would be constructed from materials that would be of a divergent appearance to the traditional palette currently present on the site and elsewhere within the vicinity of the appeal site. - This would erode the relationship between doors and windows that is currently a feature of the front elevation of the dwelling and render the proposed development an incongruous addition to the building. - The proposed development would be sited within a prominent location at the centre of the Conservation Area. Therefore, the erosion of the CA's character would be readily apparent.

Appendix 1 – Appeals Performance from 01.01.2022 – 31.03.2022

21/00560/HHFUL	10 Castle End Road Maxey Peterborough PE6 9EP	Single storey side extension and front porch (part-retrospective)	Refusal	N/A	1. The part-retrospective side extension results in a visually dominant and incongruous form which harms the character and visual amenity of the surrounding area, including Conservation Area – contrary to LP16 and LP19, and paragraph 196 of NPPF.	Householder Appeals Service	Split <i>Dismissed in regards to the element to which Officers refused the application</i> 07.01.2022	N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Council raises no objection to the proposed front porch and concur with this view. [N.B. This was the element which was allowed]. - Because the appearance of the facing brick, mortar and roof tiles of the extension noticeably differ to those used in the host building, there is an awkward visual relationship between them. - That the front wall of the side extension is flush with the main house draws the contrast in appearance into sharp focus because there is an abrupt visual transition. - As the roof slope of the side extension is shallower than that of the 2-storey building and it projects slightly forward of the main front wall, other aspects of the new addition visually accentuate this uneasy relationship. - As a result, it is obtrusive even among the varied built form along Castle End Road and within the wider CA.
21/00668/HHFUL	1 Newborn Close Stanground Peterborough PE2 8NA	Erection of 1.98m fence and removal of brick wall	Refusal	N/A	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Proposed fence would form an obtrusive and incongruous feature in the streetscene, out of character with its surroundings – contrary to LP16. 2. Fencing would obscure intervisibility between vehicles and pedestrians and would therefore be detrimental to the safety of all highway users – contrary to LP13. 	Written Representations	Dismissed 30.03.2022	N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The fence would result in an enclosing effect on the street, thereby eroding the open character of the vicinity. - Furthermore, the proposed development would conflict with the character and appearance of the neighbouring properties, which generally contain low-level brick walls and planting as boundary treatments. - The development would be sited at the entrance of a cul-de-sac, therefore any residents of neighbouring properties, or their visitors, would need to pass the appeal site, meaning that the incongruous form of development has the potential to be experienced by a great many people. - The fence would be located directly adjacent to the pavement edge and the edge of the driveway, meaning that for the drivers of vehicles looking to leave the appeal site, views of oncoming traffic and pedestrians would be obscured. - In addition, the proposed boundary treatment would also obscure views of the driveway for the drivers of other vehicles and pedestrians utilising the pavement which means that such individuals would not be able to reasonably anticipate vehicles leaving the appeal site. - The provision of visibility splays would create an irregular fence line which would

Appendix 1 – Appeals Performance from 01.01.2022 – 31.03.2022

									conflict with the prevailing character of the area.
21/00054/HHFUL	9 Westwood Park Road Peterborough PE3 6JL	Retrospective construction of carport	Refusal	N/A	1. Car port results in unacceptable visual harm to the character and appearance of the site and surrounding area. Its siting, size and materials make the structure unacceptably dominant and an incongruous feature within the street scene and surrounding area – contrary to LP16, LP19 and LP20.	Householder Appeals Service	Dismissed 15.11.2021	N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The carport is visually over dominant at the southern end of Westwood Park Road when entering the character area from Thorpe Road. - Policy LP20 aims to preserve the special character of this area by requiring new development to respect established properties and encouraging the siting of garages to the side of the houses rather than in front
21/00807/PRIOR	Land At Bourges Boulevard Millfield Peterborough	Proposed 20m Phase 8 Monopole C/W wrapround Cabinet at base and associated ancillary works	Refusal	N/A	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Proposal would be sited too close to the adjacent dual carriageway without an appropriate parking/stopping area, and as such would result in unacceptable highway safety dangers – contrary to LP13. 2. Insufficient information has been submitted to demonstrate that the siting of the development would not result in harm or loss of trees which provide an important amenity value to the area – contrary to LP16 and LP29. 	Written Representations	Dismissed 25.02.2022	N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The proposal would be situated only a short distance back from the side of the carriageway. There would be merely what is shown as a narrow concrete access track in between. This would not amount to an appropriate off-road parking/stopping area, due to its width. - It is not evident how maintenance vehicles would be accommodated with the proposal being located so close to the carriageway, and without an appropriate parking/stopping area this would pose a danger to highway safety. - The Council has taken a precautionary approach in the absence of an AIA, and information on root protection and service runs. However, not persuaded this position is consistent with how an application for prior approval is to be dealt with.
21/00902/HHFUL	91B Glington Road Helpston Peterborough PE6 7DG	First floor extension over existing garage	Refusal	N/A	1. The retrospective first floor extension results in a dwelling which appears an unduly dominant and incongruous form, giving rise to an unacceptable level of harm to the character, appearance and visual amenity of the surrounding area – contrary to LP16.	Householder Appeals Service	Allowed 12.01.2022	Refused	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The dwelling stands reasonably close to the highway and has a wide front elevation relative to its modest depth into the plot. With also its largely open highway frontage, it is a significant and prominent feature. - The appeal scheme has been carefully designed to reflect the style of the host building. Continuing the ridge and eaves levels of the main house has resulted in a more homogenous roof form than was previously the case. Matching external materials have been used and the window openings, as constructed and proposed, are in keeping with the pattern of fenestration in the host building. - For these reasons, the appeal dwelling has an acceptable appearance with the new extension in place.

Appendix 1 – Appeals Performance from 01.01.2022 – 31.03.2022

21/01021/HHFUL	Woodgate Farm 3 Woodgate Lane Maxey Peterborough PE6 9ED	Construction of boundary wall, metal railings and gates (retrospective)	Refusal	N/A	1. The boundary wall, railings and gates appear prominent in the public realm and incongruously suburban and obtrusive. Therefore they fail to respect the characteristics of the Conservation Area – contrary to LP16 and LP19, and paragraph 202 of the NPPF.	Householder Appeals Service	Dismissed 21.02.2022	N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Throughout the CA there are examples of locally distinctive stone walling. The walls are often low and used in combination with soft landscaping. These features add to the significance of the CA. - Woodgate Lane has an overriding rural character and appearance, especially as it leads into the open agricultural landscape beyond the village. - The features of the wall etc. are a fussy and ornate addition that do not reflect the rural character and traditional boundary treatment that otherwise affords the CA its significance. It is unfortunate that local stone has not been utilised because the use of modern materials has provided a neat and clinical finish out of keeping with the rustic rural scene elsewhere in the CA. The entrance gates are too grand and ornate for what is a unassuming lane, and this affords them a discordant appearance despite the visual permeability of the railings. - The security benefits of the proposal carry limited weight and are outweighed by the harm to the CA.
21/01022/HHFUL	13 Isham Road West Town Peterborough PE3 9DX	Two storey side and rear extension, single storey rear and alterations to existing dropped kerb	Refused	N/A	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The two storey side and rear extension fails to respect or reflect the size, scale and character of both the host dwelling and the surrounding area, resulting in a form of development which appears incongruous and obtrusive – contrary to LP16. 2. The proposal would be a dominant and obtrusive feature along the boundary with No.12 Isham Road, harming occupant amenity – contrary to LP17. 	Householder Appeals Service	Split <i>Dismissed in regards to the element to which Officers refused the application</i> 11.01.2022	N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Council raises no objection to the proposed alterations to the existing dropped kerb and concur with this. [N.B. This was the element which was allowed]. - Given their considerable scale and depth, the new extensions would be disproportionate additions to the host building even taking into account the built form and site coverage of the existing single storey side and rear projections that would be subsumed into the enlarged house or removed beforehand. The main outcome would be that the side and rear façades of the main dwelling would be overwhelmed. - Due to its considerable scale, height and depth along the common boundary between No 12 and the site, the overly imposing presence of the proposal would result in an intrusive and overbearing aspect for the occupiers of No 12 when seen from their front and side garden.