



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 23 February 2021

by R Sabu BA (Hons), BArch, MA, Pg Dip

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17th March 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/W0530/W/20/3261436

Land adjacent to Home Farm Cottage, Little Heath, Gamlingay SG19 3LL

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant consent, agreement or approval to details required by a condition of a planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr S Izzard against the decision of South Cambridgeshire District Council.
 - The application Ref 20/01211/REM, dated 7 February 2020, sought approval of details pursuant to condition No 1 of a planning permission Ref S/2241/17/OL, granted on 28 November 2018.
 - The application was refused by notice dated 22 September 2020.
 - The development proposed is approval of matters reserved for access, appearance, landscaping, layout and scale following outline planning permission S/2241/17/OL for the erection of two detached bungalows.
 - The details for which approval is sought are: access, appearance, landscaping, layout and scale.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the whether the proposed development would be consistent with the terms of the outline permission.

Reasons

3. Outline planning permission for the site was granted at appeal in 2018 with all matters reserved for future consideration. The description of development was the erection of two detached bungalows.
4. The eaves height of the roof would be set a significant distance above the top of the ground floor windows. This, along with the steep roof pitch would result in the roof ridge of the buildings appearing to be at a two-storey level. The large gable end projections at the rear of the proposed dwellings also add to the massing of the buildings. These features would visually result in a building that would have appear to have a two-storey massing despite the lack of dormer windows at first floor. In addition, the proposed dwellings would have accommodation in the roof space albeit with a floor area that would be less than that of the ground floor. From the evidence, the majority of Bedrooms 2 and 3 would benefit from full headroom, as would a large part of Bedroom 1. Therefore, given the two storey appearance of the proposed dwellings, the scheme would be inconsistent with the description of development for two detached bungalows.

5. I acknowledge that neither the scale and height of the scheme nor indicative elevations were submitted during the previous appeal and that the Inspector may not have been aware of the approved landscaping details for each of the three frontage dwellings. However, the Inspector nevertheless determined the outline scheme on the basis of a single storey form, consistent with the description of development of the outline application for two detached bungalows.
6. I also note that conditions removing permitted development rights to alter the roof and add dormer windows were not attached to the outline permission. However, given the overall height, scale and massing of the proposal, the dwellings would have a two-storey appearance at the outset. As such, these points have not altered my overall decision.
7. Consequently, the proposed development would not be consistent with the terms of the outline permission.

Other Matters

8. While I note the evidence regarding the character and appearance of the area, including the comments of the Inspector for the development at Slade House, given my findings above, an assessment of the effect of the proposal of the character and appearance of the area is not necessary.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given above, the appeal is dismissed.

R Sabu

INSPECTOR