
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 February 2017

by John Dowsett MA DipURP DipUD MRTPI

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

Decision date: 22nd March 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/W0530/D/16/3162059

1 Bartlow Road, Linton, Cambridgeshire CB21 4LY

- 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 and Mrs M Stockdale against the decision of South Cambridgeshire District Council.
 - The application Ref: S/2046/16/FL, dated 3 August 2016, was refused by notice dated 30 September 2016.
 - The development proposed is a single storey side extension and alterations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single storey side extension and alterations at 1 Bartlow Road, Linton, Cambridgeshire CB21 4LY in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref: S/2046/16/FL, dated 3 August 2016, and the plans numbered ST 115.01; ST 115.02A; and the Location Plan.

Procedural matter

2. The development has already been carried out and I was able to see it when I visited the site. Section 73A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) makes allowance for the submission of a planning application for development which has been carried out before the date of the application. I have therefore dealt with the appeal on this basis.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the existing building and the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal building is located at the end of a short terrace of three, two storey, houses which are finished in painted render with pitched roofs finished in pantiles. It is located at the junction of Bartlow Road and Horseheath Road and is part of a small enclave of older buildings surrounded by more recent developments, with the older historic core of the village lying to the west.
 5. In the vicinity of the appeal site, and throughout the village as a whole, a range of roofing materials is used and there are a wide variety of roof forms. There is no predominant roofing material that is characteristic of the area. Indeed the village is characterised by its variety of materials and building forms and styles, which give it a lively and visually rich character.
-

6. It is common ground between the parties that the size, location and general design of the extension are not inherently objectionable. It is also common ground that the extension does not have an adverse effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring properties. The sole matter in dispute is in relation to the use of slate as a roof covering as opposed to pantiles as specified in the initial planning application for the extension.
7. I saw when I visited the site that it is not uncommon for extensions or additions to buildings to have roofs with a different roof covering from that of the main building. Notably, immediately opposite the appeal building at number 2 Bartlow Road, a slate roofed, single storey, side extension has been added to the main building which has a clay tile covered main roof. Also in the near vicinity, number 150 High Street is a thatched building which has a side addition with both clay tiles and pantiles on the roof, and a rear extension with the roof finished in slate.
8. Whilst the ridge of the roof to the extension is close to the eaves of the main roof of the appeal building, the two roofs are not joined and the different roof coverings are not juxtaposed within the same roof structure. It is not in dispute between the parties that the extension is subservient to, and does not compete visually, with the main house.
9. The extension is visible in views from the west along High Street, but as the gable end of the extension faces west, the roof covering is not conspicuous in these views. It is apparent when passing the appeal building on Bartlow Road or Horseheath Road, however, at this point it is seen in the context of the varied roofing materials of the immediately surrounding buildings.
10. The appeal building is not listed and is not within a conservation area. Having regard to this and the points set out above, I do not find the argument that the use of slates as a roofing material on the extension is harmful to the appeal building and the surrounding area a persuasive one. The development is consistent with other buildings in the area and therefore has a neutral effect that, consequently, preserves the character and appearance of the existing building and its surroundings.
11. I therefore conclude that the development does not cause harm to the character and appearance of the appeal building and the surrounding area. It would comply with the relevant requirements of Policy DP/2 of the South Cambridgeshire Development Control Policies Development Plan Document 2007 which seeks to ensure that new development preserves or enhances the character of the local area, and is compatible with its location and appropriate in terms of scale, mass, form, siting, design, proportion and materials.

Other matters

12. I have noted the comments which have been made by the Parish Council. When I visited the site, I did not see anything that would indicate that the extension has not been constructed in line with the submitted plans. Whilst the repositioned doorway is not the same width as that shown on the drawing, this is not part of the appeal proposal and would not, of itself, ordinarily require planning permission. The windows throughout the appeal building also appeared to be consistent with each other.

Conditions

13. As the development has already been carried out it is not necessary to impose a condition in respect of the time period for commencement of the works. As the development is substantially complete and the materials are specified on the submitted drawings and the planning application form, it is not necessary to impose a specific condition in relation to external materials. The Council have not suggested that any additional conditions are required.

Conclusion

14. For the above reasons, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

John Dowsett

INSPECTOR