



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 July 2020

by D. Szymanski, BSc (Hons) MA, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 30th July 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/V0510/D/20/3247441

4a Perry Close, Haddenham, Ely, Cambs, CB6 3SU

- 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 Rob Lasham against the decision of East Cambridgeshire District Council.
 - The application Ref: 19/01029/FUL dated 14 November 2019, was refused by notice dated 8 January 2020.
 - The development proposed is described as re-submission of previously refused Ref: 19/01098/FUL – first floor extension above existing single storey side and rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a first floor extension above existing single storey side and rear extension at 4a Perry Close, Haddenham, Ely, Cambs, CB6 3SU in accordance with the terms of the application Ref: 19/01029/FUL dated 14 November 2019, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans: 01/2247/19; 02/2247/19; 03/2247/19; 04/2247/19; 05/2247/19; 06/2247/19; and, 07a/2247/19.
 - 3) 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.
 - 4) Prior to the occupation of the first-floor extension, the first-floor side facing windows shall be fitted with obscure glazing that shall be permanently retained thereafter.

Procedural Matter

2. The description of the development in the banner heading above is taken from the original planning application form. In the formal decision paragraph, I have omitted the reference to the proposed development being a re-submission of a previous proposal, as this is not an act of development.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development upon the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area.

Reasons

4. The street scene comprises mostly semi-detached or terraced dwellings of a similar age and style with hipped or gable roofs and some variations of either side or rear projections. The appeal site (No. 4a) forms part of what it appears was once one of a pair of semi-detached dwellings (originally being part of No. 4). No. 4 appears to be accessed by the original front door and the appeal site front door is in the gable roof single storey side projection.
5. Although most properties in Perry Close have retained much original character, some additions and a number of outbuildings/garages on the side of plots reduce the sense of symmetry, and Nos. 1 and 15 have two storey side extensions. Notwithstanding this, the wide gaps between dwellings are maintained allowing views of vegetation and other properties nearby to form a backdrop. The proposed extension would maintain the gable roof shape, pitch and set-back of the existing side projection upon which it would be located. This and brickwork, roof tiles and window materials to match the existing dwelling would result in the development being in keeping with the character and appearance of the host dwelling, and similar style properties nearby.
6. The rear cross gable roof design would be similar to the rear extension at No. 4. It would be set behind the front gable roof and its lower ridge height limits its visibility and massing. By not increasing the width of the projection, retaining its setback and including a set down to the roof ridge, the development would be subservient to the main building. It would also retain the large verdant space between the appeal site and neighbouring No. 5 which is a distinctive feature of this part of Perry Close. Therefore, it would not appear dominant or obtrusive from the street scene.
7. Whilst the development would reduce symmetry with No. 3, retaining the shape, form, setback, lower cross gable roof and materials, would minimise the perception of difference from the street scene. Furthermore, the development would be viewed in the context of and backdrop of other style roofs such as the hipped roofs in Perry Close, and dwellings on Mallard Close, Camping Close and Duck Lane. For these reasons I do not find the reduced symmetry would be obtrusive or harmful to the character and appearance of the area.
8. For the reasons set out above the proposed development would not conflict with the requirements of Policies ENV1 and ENV2 of the East Cambridgeshire Local Plan (2015) (the Local Plan). In combination and amongst other things these policies require that development is designed to a high quality and demonstrates its scale, form, design, massing and materials protects and enhances the character and appearance of the area.
9. Policy ENV2 requires regard is had to the Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (2012) (the SPD). Although the development appears to comply with much of the relevant advice, the SPD seeks to secure symmetry where possible and advises it will rarely be acceptable to construct a two-storey side extension to one property only. Notwithstanding the limited conflict with this advice, I conclude that the proposed development would not be

harmful to the character and appearance of the host property or the surrounding area, so does not conflict with Policy ENV1 and ENV2. The development would also be compliant with paragraph 127c) of the National Planning Policy Framework (2019) as it would be sympathetic to and maintain the sense of local character.

Other Matters

10. The Council concludes the development is acceptable in respect of the living conditions of neighbouring properties and is compliant with Policy ENV2 of the Local Plan in this regard. Although there are side (west) facing windows, these would be approximately 1.8m above floor level and obscure glazed. Therefore, I see no reason to disagree.

Conditions

11. As well as the standard condition for the commencement of the development, for certainty a condition requiring the development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans is necessary. To ensure a satisfactory appearance, a condition requiring the use of external materials to match the existing dwelling is necessary. A condition is necessary to require the first-floor western side facing windows are obscure glazed, to ensure an adequate level of privacy to neighbouring properties. I have amended the appellant's suggested condition by requiring the glazing is retained to ensure it is sufficiently precise.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons set out above, the appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted.

Dan Szymanski

INSPECTOR