
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 February 2017

by Richard Aston BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 17th February 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/W0530/D/16/3163613

32 Buristead Road, Great Shelford, Cambridgeshire CB22 5EJ

- 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 Ben Heath against the decision of South Cambridgeshire District Council.
 - The application Ref S/1604/16/FL, dated 8 June 2016, was refused by notice dated 31 August 2016.
 - The development proposed is side and rear extension and a new porch.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a 2 storey, semi-detached house constructed from brick at ground floor with a rendered first floor, under a concrete tile roof. It is located in a street of similar properties and although there are isolated examples of more contemporary development at the end of the road, the prevailing character and appearance is one of dwellings with a visual cohesion and uniformity, with single storey garaging in between and gaps at first floor level that positively contributes to the character and appearance of the area.
 4. The extension would utilise a markedly different palette of materials by introducing a burnt timber cladding, translucent Reglit roof covering and irregular, square flush windows. The first floor extension would be set back from the front elevation but nonetheless, the proposal would be clearly conspicuous on the approach up and down this part of the road. The timber cladding would introduce a strong vertical emphasis which would undoubtedly draw the eye to the proposal, in stark contrast to the more traditional appearance of the host property. Its effect would be exacerbated by a rather bland side and rear elevation with little visual relief. Moreover, the form of the extension, in particular the flat, box shaped roof arrangement would extend above the existing eaves and would not reflect the existing roof.
 5. I have some sympathy with the appellants desire to introduce a modern extension that sets itself apart from the host building and I also accept that it is not always unacceptable for an extension to not always replicate the
-

traditional design or appearance of an existing building. However, in this particular case the proposal would be noticeably out of keeping and discordant with the character and appearance of the host property. It would be a jarring and incongruous addition that in its context would not represent a high quality of design and would diminish the contribution that the appeal property currently makes to the character and appearance of the area.

6. For these reasons, the proposal would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the host property and area. It would conflict with Policy DP/2 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Development Framework Development Control Policies Development Plan Document 2007 ('DPD') which, amongst other things, requires all new development to be of a high quality design, respects local distinctiveness, be appropriate in terms of scale, mass, form, design and materials and preserve or enhance the character of the local area.

Other Matters

7. The appellant has referred to a number of other examples of the use of timber which are contended demonstrate the acceptability of such a material. This includes extensions at Nos. 13 and No. 9 and what appears to be a new dwelling at No. 37. I also note that there are other examples of the use of such material in the wider area, including in an adjoining conservation area. However, although the extension at No. 13 utilises a black horizontal weatherboarding, it is solely contained to the rear of the dwelling and is much less conspicuous. The extension at No. 9 is of a more traditional and sympathetic form, comprising a two storey side addition with a gable end pitched roof. No. 37 does contain timber elements but these are restricted to the ground floor front and side extensions.
8. Whilst there may well be isolated historical examples I have found that the use of such a material is not prevalent within the road. Furthermore, I have not been provided with the full details of the local examples and therefore cannot be certain that the circumstances are directly comparable to the proposal before me. Consequently, they do not justify or outweigh the harm that I have identified in relation to the main issue.
9. I also acknowledge the appellant's apparent frustration concerning the handling of the application. However, the administration and determination of the application by the Council are not matters for me to address as part of this appeal and have no bearing on its planning merits.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons set out above the proposal would conflict with the development plan, when read as a whole. Material considerations do not indicate that the proposal should be determined other than in accordance with the development plan and having considered all other matters raised, I therefore conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Richard Aston

INSPECTOR