



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 October 2019

by Graham Wyatt BA (Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 1st November 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/W0530/D/19/3234128

1 Greenfields, Eltisley, Cambridgeshire PE19 6TN

- 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 Johnson against the decision of South Cambridgeshire District Council.
 - The application Ref S/1727/19/FL, dated 15 May 2019, was refused by notice dated 10 July 2019.
 - The development proposed is described as a “two storey front extension, single storey side and rear extension – amended resubmission of planning application S/4805/18/FL”.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the development on:
 - the character and appearance of the area; and,
 - the living conditions of adjoining occupiers with particular regard to visual intrusion to 9 and 11 Caxton End.

Reasons

3. The appeal site forms a semi-detached two storey dwelling that is located within a mainly residential area. The front elevation of the dwelling faces onto a grassed area that is surrounded by pavements so that the appeal site does not benefit from a road frontage. To the rear of the site is a walled garden area that contains a single storey brick outbuilding.
4. The area is generally residential in character and contains mainly bungalows within the immediate vicinity of the appeal site, although two storey dwellings are in the wider area. The proposal seeks to erect a two storey extension to the front of the dwelling and a single storey extension that would wrap around the side and rear of the property.
5. Notwithstanding that the appeal site benefits from an existing single storey extension to the front of the building, given its scale, the proposed two storey extension would fundamentally alter the characteristics of the dwelling, to its detriment. Although the proposed two storey extension would be half the width of the dwelling and its ridge line set lower than the existing ridge height, it would nonetheless protrude some 4.3m from its principal elevation, giving the perception of practically doubling the overall length of the building. It would

result in a visually dominant and discordant form of development, quite out of keeping with the scale of the host property and the character and appearance of the area.

6. Turning to the single storey side and rear extensions, I am not persuaded that this would result in the same dominance as the two storey front extension. Moreover, I do not find the design of the development with the addition of three windows to the front or the repositioning of the front door to overwhelm the character of the dwelling as suggested by the Council. It is the scale of the two storey projection to the front of the dwelling that would result in material harm to the character and appearance of the area for the reasons given above. Moreover, despite the presence of a tree to the front of the site, the harm to the character of the area would be clearly visible from surrounding properties and from the footpaths that cross the green spaces close to the site.
7. Thus, the development would result in material harm to the character and appearance of the area. It would be in conflict with Policy HQ/1 of the South Cambridgeshire District Council Local Plan 2018 (the Local Plan) which seeks, amongst other things, that developments are compatible with its location and appropriate in terms of scale.

Living Conditions

8. To the south of the appeal site is a terrace of four bungalows at 9 - 15 Caxton Lane that have their rear elevations and garden space facing towards the side elevation of the appeal site. Nos 9 and 11 Caxton Lane would be closest to the proposed development. The garden areas of 9 and 11 Caxton Lane are bounded by a wall and separated by an alley that runs between the two sites. Nonetheless, on viewing the bungalows from the front of the appeal site, windows in their rear elevations are visible over the top of the wall. Thus, the proposed development would be clearly visible over the boundary wall from the rear of both 9 and 11 Caxton Lane.
9. While I accept that privacy and light to the bungalows to the south is unlikely to be affected by the development. Nevertheless, although the height of the extension would be lower than the existing building, it would nonetheless still represent a very large extension that would protrude forward of the front elevation of the existing dwelling by a significant distance. This would result in a sense of enclosure created by the large expanse of wall adjacent to the rear gardens of 9 and 11 Caxton Lane. This would result in an intrusion into the visual amenities and would harm the outlook that is currently afforded from the rear elevations and garden areas from 9 and 11 Caxton Lane.
10. Thus, the development would harm the living conditions of adjoining occupiers. It would be in conflict with Policy HQ/1 of the Local Plan which seeks, amongst other things, to protect the amenity of occupiers from development that is overbearing.

Other Matters

11. The appellant refers to paragraphs 77 and 78 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework). However, the development before me is not a proposal that is espoused by the Framework for rural exception or affordable housing. Moreover, I note the appellant's desire for a larger house to support his growing family that would in turn also support the vitality of the village. I

also acknowledge the appellant's argument regarding the perceived lack of suitable accommodation in the area. While noting the benefits that would result in this respect, I do not consider that either individually or cumulatively they outweigh the harm identified above.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above, and having regard to the development plan when read as a whole, the appeal is dismissed.

Graham Wyatt

INSPECTOR