
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 September 2020

by Benjamin Clarke BA (Hons.) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: Thursday, 17 September 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/W0530/D/20/3249959

9 Hunts Road, Duxford CB22 4RE

- 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 Leah Kennerley against the decision of South Cambridgeshire District Council.
 - The application Ref: S/4193/19/FL, dated 30 November 2019, was refused by notice dated 7 February 2020.
 - The development proposed is a single storey side extension and loft conversion.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. Amongst other works, the planning application sought planning permission for a roof extension. From the evidence before me, the main issue is the effect of the roof extension upon the character and appearance of the site and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site consists of a semi-detached bungalow. The surrounding dwellings are a combination of bungalows and houses that are arranged in a linear form. The neighbouring property at No. 11 is a house, whilst the appellant's bungalow is attached to a similar bungalow at No. 7. There are additional bungalows to the rear of the appeal site, in Bustler's Rise.
4. The proposed development consists of a rear extension that includes a roof shape that would slope upwards from the ridge of the roof of the existing bungalow. In consequence, this results in a bulky form of development arising from the massing of the development.
5. Whilst there is a variety in terms of buildings heights, the surrounding area can be characterised by traditional forms of architecture. This means that the surrounding dwellings generally feature dual pitched roofs, with a clearly visible ridge. This design approach allows for the settlement of Duxford to transition towards the open countryside beyond. This would be eroded by the form of the proposed extension, owing to the significantly different, and bulkier, design approach.

6. This is of concern as the proposed development would be clearly visible from the garden at the neighbouring property at No. 7, and from the rear gardens from the dwellings to the rear of the appeal site.
7. In addition, views of the side elevation of the proposed extension would be visible through the gap between the existing dwelling and the neighbouring dwelling at No. 11. To a limited extent, there would be some views of the extension from Bustler's Rise. Due to these factors, the proposed development would be a prominent addition to the surrounding area.
8. I acknowledge that the proposed development might not be viewable from the area directly in front of the appeal site. However, this arrangement would not mitigate the adverse effects arising from the views of the proposed development between the appeal site and No. 11. In consequence, the proposed extension would appear to be unduly incongruous and a strident addition to the dwelling and would erode the character of the vicinity. This effect would be exacerbated by the palette of materials. In particular, the use of timber cladding would add to the inappropriate form of development as this is not a material present at the appeal site.
9. Whilst the proposed extension is set back from the eaves of the existing dwelling, this does not overcome the adverse effects arising from the general form and roof shape of the development.
10. I have given some consideration as to whether additional landscaping, or screening, could mitigate the inappropriate form of the proposed extension. However, any such screening would have only a limited effect and, in the case of landscaping, would take some time to become established. In consequence, such screening would not satisfactorily overcome my previous concerns.
11. The planning application associated with the appeal scheme was not the subject of objections from the occupiers of neighbouring properties or from the Parish Council. Whilst these are matters of note, they are only some of the matters that must be considered as part of the appeal process.
12. My attention has been drawn to an approval of planning permission in Cambridge. I have not been provided with the full information regarding the planning circumstances of this, which lessens the weight that I can attribute to it. Furthermore, the differences in the nature of the respective settlements mean that the presence of a planning permission elsewhere does not enable me to disregard my preceding points.
13. I therefore conclude that the proposed roof extension would have an adverse effect upon the character and appearance of the site and the surrounding area. The development, in this regard, would conflict with Policy HQ/1 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan (2018). This policy, amongst other matters, requires that developments be compatible with their location and be appropriate in terms of form, design, proportion, and materials.

Conclusion

14. For the preceding reasons, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Benjamin Clarke

INSPECTOR