



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 August 2017

by R Norman BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

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

Decision date: 06 September 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/W0530/D/17/3180229
109, Bramley Way, Hardwick CB23 7XE

- 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 Mrs Tracy Majka against the decision of South Cambridgeshire District Council.
 - The application Ref S/1030/17/FL, dated 16 March 2017, was refused by notice dated 19 May 2017.
 - The development proposed is 2 storey side extension and single storey porch replacement.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a 2 storey side extension and single storey porch replacement at 109, Bramley Way, Hardwick CB23 7XE in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref S/1030/17/FL, dated 16 March 2017, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Drawing No -wd-A1-01 PA; and Site Location Plan.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the 2 storey side extension on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is located within an existing residential estate. There are a variety of dwellings present, in terms of design and scales, which include 2 storey properties and bungalows. A number of the dwellings in Bramley Way have porch extensions, and the semi-detached dwelling adjoining the appeal dwelling has a 2 storey, forward projecting side extension. In the surrounding streets there are several examples of large side extensions to the dwellings.
4. The proposed development would introduce a 2 storey side extension, adjacent to the road, as well as a single storey porch extension. The side extension would be set down from the existing ridge height and set back from the existing front elevation. It would sit adjacent to the footpath and road. Whilst

this positioning and projection would alter the views from within Bramley Way, the views are currently of a residential estate would not be changed to a harmful degree. This part of Bramley Way comprises of a series of cul-de-sacs and there is a limited sense of openness. The side extension would not detract harmfully from the existing level of openness and would be appropriate given the estate nature of the surrounding area.

5. Whilst the side extension would extend the existing dwelling out towards the road, this would not appear overly dominant, given the set down and set back of the extension, resulting in a subservient addition to the main dwelling. Furthermore, given the mix of dwelling scales, design and other large extensions in the surrounding area, particularly the large side extension to the adjoining semi-detached dwelling, the development would not be harmful to the existing character and appearance of the area.
6. Given the above considerations the development would comply with policy DP/2 of the South Cambridgeshire District Council Local Development Framework Development Control Policies (2007) which seeks to ensure that all new development must be of a high quality design and preserve or enhance the character of the local area, and the National Planning Policy Framework which seeks to secure high quality design.

Conditions

7. In addition to the standard time limit condition I have included a condition listing the approved plans in the interest of clarity. A condition requiring the materials to match the existing dwelling is not necessary as this has been detailed on the submitted plan.
8. I note in the Council's submitted report that reference was made to the first floor window in the rear elevation being fixed shut and obscure glazed. A condition to secure this is not necessary given the distances between the rear elevation and neighbouring dwelling and the window would serve an en suite and is therefore likely to be obscure glazed in any case.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

R Norman

INSPECTOR