
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 May 2020

by M Shrigley BSc (Hons) MPlan MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25 June 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/W0530/D/20/3245295

67, Bramley Avenue, Melbourn, Cambridge SG8 6HG

- 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 Chandler & Miss Free against the decision of South Cambridgeshire District Council.
 - The application Ref S/3861/19/FL, dated 8 November 2019, was refused by notice dated 6 January 2020.
 - The development proposed is a single storey side extension to house.
-

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 area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is semi-detached, situated on a corner plot. Substantial areas of open soft landscaping and domestic plantings visible from the highway form noticeable and attractive characteristics of the street-scene.
4. The extension would extend out to the side of the property by over half of the frontage width of the main dwelling house. In doing so this would significantly reduce the existing open, planned landscaped gap to the side of the property in the context of the surrounding estate road layout. The extension would be visible as an incongruous feature due to its dimensions and proximity to the highway.
5. I note the appellants refer to a variety of other extensions in the wider area to support the merits of their case. But the other extensions referred to are not within the immediate street-scene of the appeal property and include differing site circumstances that are not directly comparable. As a result, I afford little weight to those examples.
6. The scale and mass of the extension would be prominent from public views along Bramley Avenue as well as Hinkins Close. Its presence would detract from the prevailing attractive planned landscaped components of the street-scene which are integral to the design of the estate. I acknowledge external facing materials matching those of the host dwelling are proposed by the

appellant as well as the offer to replace any damaged soft landscaping which could be conditioned. However, these considerations do not overcome my fundamental concerns as to the effect of the proposal upon preserving the attractiveness of the area.

7. Consequently, I conclude the development would result in harm to the character and appearance of the locality. The development conflicts with Policy HQ/1 criterion (a) of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018 which seeks high quality design to preserve or enhance the character of the local area and for development to respond to the context of the wider landscape.

Conclusion

8. For the reasons given above I dismiss the appeal.

M Shrigley

INSPECTOR