
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 April 2017

by R A Exton Dip URP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 5th May 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/W0530/D/17/3168804

28 Winfold Road, Waterbeach, Cambridge CB25 9PR

- 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 & Mrs D McMurray against the decision of South Cambridgeshire District Council.
 - The application Ref S/3055/16/FL, dated 4 November 2016, was refused by notice dated 6 January 2017.
 - The development proposed is two storey side extension and single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. Winfold Road and the surrounding area is characterised by late twentieth century housing with some variation but an overall degree of uniformity. Dwellings are typically set back from the road behind garden or parking areas. Their designs generally follow a traditional form with isolated examples of more modern design. In terms of appearance, brick and tile of varying colours are the dominant materials with sporadic examples of render and timber cladding as feature panels. The appeal dwelling forms one half of a pair of semi-detached houses of rectangular footprint constructed of brick and tile.
 4. The two storey element of the proposed extension would approximately double the frontage of the dwelling and bring it very close to the site's boundary with the footpath. The extension is designed to have stepped down ridge heights and a staggered set back from the front elevation. These factors combine to create an appearance that would be out of character with the scale and design of the host dwelling.
 5. Upon entering Winfold Road from Denny End Road, the appeal site occupies a prominent position within the street scene. This position would make the two storey extension highly visible and emphasise its difference in appearance to the host dwelling and those in the surrounding area. In some instances a prominent building can make a positive contribution to the street scene but in
-

this case the proposal would form a dominant and uncharacteristic addition to the both the host dwelling and the surrounding area. Whilst I note the design of the extension is intended to reduce its impact and add visual interest, I consider that the varied ridge heights and staggered footprint would further emphasise the difference in appearance to the host dwelling.

6. The plank boarding proposed at first floor level on the extension is not a material evident elsewhere on the host dwelling or typical within the surrounding area. Whilst contrasting materials can sometimes add variety and interest, in this instance the amount of coverage of plank boarding at first floor level together with the site's prominent position would result in an uncharacteristic appearance. The appellant draws attention to the use of boarding/cladding as an external material on other dwellings in the immediate and wider surrounding area, some of which I observed on my site visit. In the other instances where these materials are used in the immediate area surrounding the appeal site I consider that either the areas they cover, their position on the dwelling or their prominence with the surrounding area are less than on the appeal site and consequently their impact is different. Use of such materials in wider surrounding areas with different characters does not bear direct comparison to the appeal site.
7. I find that overall, the two storey extension would have a dominant impact that would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area. It would therefore be contrary to the design aims of Policy DP/2, criteria 1a and 1f, of the South Cambridgeshire Local Development Framework, Development Control Policies DPD 2007 and paragraphs 7.40 and 7.44 the District Design Guide SPD 2010. I note the appellant's contention that the proposal complies with other aspects of the policy and supplementary guidance but do not consider that these outweigh the harm and conflict with policy I have identified.

Other matters

8. I understand the appellant's personal reasons for requiring the extension and note the benefits it would provide in terms of maximising use of space within the site and improved fire resistance but do not consider that these outweigh the harm and conflict I have identified. I note the appellant's comments on the Councils handling of this and the previous application on the site but as I have determined this appeal on its own merits based on the evidence before me I attach little weight to this in arriving at my conclusion. The appellant has drawn attention to a number of other extensions and appeal decisions in support of this proposal. There is either insufficient information on the circumstances of these cases for me to make any assessment or, from the information provided I am satisfied that they do not bear direct comparison to the main issue in this appeal to an extent that alters my conclusion.

Conclusion

9. For the above reasons and having regard to all other matters raised I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Richard Exton

INSPECTOR