



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 October 2021

by K Winnard LL.B (Hons) Solicitor

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 02 November 2021.

Appeal Ref: APP/V0510/D/21/3279038

16 Upton Place Littleport Ely CB6 1LE

- 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 Neil Coburn against the decision of East Cambridgeshire District Council.
 - The application Ref 21/00355/FUL, dated 4 March 2021, was refused by notice dated 29 April 2021.
 - The development proposed is a revised design front porch.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a revised design front porch at 16 Upton Place Littleport Ely CB6 1LE in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 21/00355/FUL, dated 4 March 2021, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 01/2366A/20, 02/2366A/20, 06/2366A/20 and 07/2336A/20.
 - 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.

Procedural Matter

2. In July 2021, the Government published its revised National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework). It replaces the previous version published in February 2019. The Framework represents the Government's up to date planning policies for England and how they should be applied. The circumstances of this appeal are such that it has not been necessary to seek comments from the parties on the revised Framework.

Main Issue

3. The effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property, No 16 Upton Place (No 16) is the end property of a group of 4 dwellings which have a straight forward and pleasing design. This design is reflected elsewhere on the estate whereby the two end dwellings have a gable end appearance to the front and the adjacent properties a front to back pitch. As a result, a notable feature of the dwellings are the high roofs resulting in a large façade across the group of properties. No 16 occupies a corner plot with a large external amenity area to its front and side. On this area is sited a large modern outbuilding set forward on the frontage to Upton Place. The outbuilding gives an unbalanced look to this part of Upton Place and obscures in part direct views of the front elevation of No 16.
5. On my site visit I observed a variety of rain canopies but did not note many porches nor any examples of a wrap around porch such as the proposal. The proposed porch would alter the appearance of No 16 and its associated group and introduce a feature not commonly seen in the area. However, the presence of the outbuilding forward of the dwelling means that the porch would be obscured in the majority of views. In other views it would be seen against the backdrop of the outbuilding and the wider amenity area of No 16. The porch is single storey in scale and its floor width would not be disproportionate to the overall size of the dwelling. Its design would reflect that of the outbuilding and the large front elevation of No 16 would remain a dominant feature. As such, the symmetry of the first floor facades across the group of dwellings would not be materially affected. Accordingly in my view the proposed scheme would be subservient to the dwelling and would not unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the dwelling and the streetscene.
6. Accordingly the proposal would be in accordance with Policies ENV1 and ENV2 of the East Cambridgeshire Local Plan (2015) which require amongst other things, for development to be complementary to existing development and for the layout, scale, form and massing to relate sympathetically to the surrounding area. There is no specific reference to porches within the East Cambridgeshire Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document other than for heritage assets. However the porch would be in accordance with the guidance relating more generally to extensions in that it would be subservient to the existing dwelling which would still be clearly legible. Nor would it conflict with the Framework which encourages good design and seeks to promote development sympathetic to local character.

Other Matter

7. I note that the Council has no concerns in relation to the residential amenity of the occupiers of adjacent dwellings. Given the separation distances of adjoining properties, I would agree with this assessment.

Conditions

8. Conditions in respect of timescales and specifying the approved plans are necessary as this provides certainty. A condition regarding the materials to be used is necessary to ensure that the appearance of the development is satisfactory.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given and having taken all other matters into account, I allow the appeal as set out in the formal decision above.

K Winnard

INSPECTOR