



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 July 2019

by L Perkins BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 5th August 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/W0530/D/19/3232211
Mill House, 49 Broadway, Bourn CB23 2TA

- 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 Richard Zubrik against the decision of South Cambridgeshire District Council.
 - The application Ref S/1054/19/FL, dated 18 March 2019, was refused by notice dated 6 June 2019.
 - The development proposed is described as follows: Rear extension to the existing bungalow. Rear extension will be a chalet style and therefore include a room in the loft of the extension. This means the roof ridge will be 1.35m higher than the current roof. The extension is the same width as the current house and will extend the house by 7m.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a 1.5 storey rear extension, at Mill House, 49 Broadway, Bourn CB23 2TA, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref S/1054/19/FL, dated 18 March 2019, 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 materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
 - 3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: ZUB-000, ZUB-001, ZUB-002, ZUB-003, ZUB-004, ZUB-005, ZUB-006, ZUB-007, ZUB-008.

Preliminary Matters

2. The description of development in the heading above has been taken from the planning application form. However, in Part E of the appeal form a different description has been given and this reflects that stated on the Council's decision notice. As this more succinctly describes the development I have used that description in my formal decision.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is in the countryside. It contains a large detached bungalow on a substantial plot which fronts Broadway and which is surrounded by trees and thick planting. The bungalow forms part of a group of homes which line either side of this part of Broadway.
5. The existing bungalow is unique in that all the other homes in this group are modest 2 storey semi-detached houses. In this respect, given the unique design of the appeal dwelling, it is the other houses in the group that reflect the predominant character and appearance of homes in the area.
6. The appeal development is for an extension to the rear of the bungalow. It would include an additional floor of accommodation within the roof space of the extension. The roof of the extension would be raised up above the existing roof of the bungalow but would reflect the same pitch as the existing roof.
7. Whilst the proposed extension would be large compared to the other houses in the immediate context, in my judgment, it is an acceptable size when compared with the size of the existing dwelling on the plot and would be sufficiently subservient and proportionate to it, despite the increase in height. Given the size of the plot, the unique design of the bungalow in this context and the concealed location of the proposed extension, I am satisfied the proposal would not harm the character or appearance of the area.
8. Even when deciduous trees surrounding the site are not in leaf, the extension would not be prominent as it would be sited away from the road and any public footpaths. I conclude the proposal would not conflict with Policy HQ/1 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018 (the Local Plan) which seeks that new development preserve or enhance the character of the local area.
9. The Council's decision notice states the proposal would be contrary to parts (a) and (b) of Policy H/13 of the Local Plan. This states that extensions to dwellings outside the village framework boundaries shown on the Policies Map will be permitted where: (a) the development would not create a separate dwelling or be capable of separation from the existing dwelling; and (b) the extension is in scale and character with the existing dwelling and would not materially change its impact on its surroundings.
10. In respect of part (a), the proposed extension may be technically capable of separation from the existing dwelling with relatively minor alterations. However, other than the effect on character and appearance (which I have considered above), limited information has been provided to explain what harm would arise from the proposal or what the scale of that harm would be.
11. Moreover, a separate dwelling is not what has been applied for in this case and, under section 55 of the above Act, a separate planning permission would be required for this in any event. As such, I am not satisfied that permission for the development before me should be withheld on the basis of Policy H/13 (a). As I have found the extension would not harm the character or appearance of the area, I am not satisfied permission should be withheld on the basis of part (b) of Policy H/13 either.

Conditions and Conclusion

12. In addition to an implementation condition, conditions are necessary to ensure the development is carried out as approved and to require it is constructed with external facing materials which match the existing building. These conditions are in the interests of the character and appearance of the area.
13. The Council has suggested a condition is necessary to prevent the extension being occupied other than as ancillary to the existing dwelling. But due to the provisions of section 55 noted above a condition to this effect is not necessary. Subject to the necessary conditions set out above, the appeal is allowed.

L Perkins

INSPECTOR