
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 November 2016

by Philip Major BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 28th November 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/H0520/D/16/3160180
16 Beech Grove, St Neots PE19 1HE.

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr James Langley against the decision of Huntingdonshire District Council.
 - The application Ref: 16/01115/HHFUL, dated 25 May 2016, was refused by notice dated 24 August 2016.
 - The development proposed is a 2 storey extension to the front elevation, hip ridged roofline, window to the front elevation.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in the appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The existing dwelling at the appeal site already has a modest front extension which is attached to a similar projection at the adjoining property. But these are small and proportionate extensions in relation to the main houses. In contrast the extension now proposed would be of far greater mass and bulk. It would dominate the front elevation of the property.
 4. At present the houses which line the street are of similar form in that they have consistent main facades with only small front projections. This gives the street a regular character in which the dwellings are unobtrusive and of similar uncomplicated design. The proposed extension would interrupt the rhythm of the street and introduce an incongruous feature which would clash with the restrained appearance of the existing houses. The development would also unbalance the pair of dwellings of which it forms a part, adding a further discordant note in the street scene.
 5. I have noted the comments made in the grounds of appeal but do not agree that the proposal reflects the original build or retains any similarity with neighbouring properties. Cladding the first floor in timber would not, in my judgement, assist in assimilating the extension in its surroundings. The nearby examples cited by the Appellant do not appear to me to bear any comparable characteristics in terms of their impact on the locality, and many of them are of
-

single storey construction and therefore have a quite different impact. I find them to be of little assistance to me in determining this appeal.

6. The development plan includes saved policies of the Huntingdonshire Local Plan of 1995. Though of some age Policy En25 conforms with the thrust of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) which encourages good design that enhances the locality. The incongruous nature of the proposals in this instance is in conflict with Policy En25. There is also conflict with Policy CS1 of the Huntingdonshire LDF Core Strategy which was adopted in 2009, and which also seeks to ensure that development promotes well designed places. Similarly there is conflict with Policy LP 13 of the draft Huntingdonshire Local Plan to 2036 which also requires good design, and this policy can be afforded some weight.
7. Taking the case as a whole it is my judgement that the proposed development would be harmful to the character and appearance of the surrounding area and in conflict with local and national policy.
8. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Philip Major

INSPECTOR