



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/21/3282645

8A Perry Close Haddenham Ely 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 Chris Woodhouse against the decision of East Cambridgeshire District Council.
 - The application Ref.21/00921/FUL, dated 8 July 2021, was refused by notice dated 9 September 2021.
 - The development proposed is a first floor front extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The appellant refers to alternative design proposals for the appeal scheme and has forwarded a new plan within the appeal documentation. The amended plan and the alternative options have not been considered by the Council or been subject to any form of consultation. As such and given the lack of details, it would not be appropriate for me to consider these alternative options. I will base my decision on the information and plans which were assessed by the Council during the original planning application.

Main Issues

3. The main issues in the appeal are (i) the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area, and (ii) the effect of the development on the living conditions of the occupiers of the host dwelling with particular regard to light.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

4. The appeal property, No 8A Perry Close, (No 8A) is a modern detached house sited on a far corner plot at the end of Perry Close and adjacent to a public footpath. It differs from the properties elsewhere on Perry Close which are semi detached/terraced dwellings fronting the highway, and as such it lacks the cohesive character of development seen elsewhere on the street. Whilst due to its siting, the dwelling's visibility is limited from Perry Close, it is a dominant

feature when walking the footpath between Perry Close and Camping Close, a neighbouring street.

5. The introduction of a first floor extension over the current single storey elements of the dwelling would considerably increase its height and prominence. Although lower than the existing roof, the bulk and part flat roof design would be out of keeping with its original design and it would appear as a cramped and disproportionate addition to the dwelling. The additional height and mass of the extension on the two elevations adjacent to the public footpath would be oppressive and dominate the footpath at this particular location. As such the proposed scheme would be unacceptably harmful to the host dwelling and the streetscene insofar as it relates to the public footpath.
6. I appreciate that the appellant indicates that the footpath is not used often. Even if that were the case, this does not make it acceptable in design terms. I acknowledge too that due to its age, siting, materials and design No 8A is distinct from the other dwellings on Perry Close and the immediate locality. However, these features do not justify development which would otherwise be unacceptable. The appellant has also referred to extensions having been built to other properties on Perry Close. Given that No 8A is a distinct dwelling it is unlikely that they represent a direct parallel with the current proposal before me and as such comparisons are not easy to draw. In any event I have determined this appeal proposal on its own merits and for the reasons stated have found the development as proposed would be unacceptable.
8. For the reasons given, whilst the development would have a limited impact of the streetscene on Perry Close, I conclude that the development would be a visually obtrusive form of development to the host dwelling and to the streetscene in its immediate location. Accordingly, the development would be contrary to Policies ENV 1 and ENV2 of the East Cambridgeshire Local Plan (2015) (Local Plan) 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 and each other.

Living Conditions

9. The proposal before me would result in the loss of the existing window in the first floor bedroom of the dwelling proposed to be extended. Natural light would be largely confined to the new part of the bedroom. The existing bedroom is not of a large size and the depth of the proposed extension would add a considerable built form at the other side of the opening created by the removal of the window. This would result in a loss of natural light to this part of the bedroom, which would have an appreciable effect on the residential amenity of the occupiers of this room. As such it would be contrary to Policy ENV2 of the Local Plan which requires that occupiers and users of new buildings enjoy a high standard of amenity.

Other Matters

10. I appreciate the wish of the appellant to create additional family living accommodation. Whilst I have given the personal circumstances as set out, careful consideration I am mindful of the advice contained in Planning Practice Guidance that in general planning is concerned with land use in the public interest and that personal circumstances seldom outweigh such considerations.

11. I note that the Council does not raise any other concerns with regard to the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring properties or to the proposed changes to parking arrangements at the property. However the absence of harm in these respects do not weigh in favour of the appeal scheme. In addition, I note too that there are no objections to the proposal from the occupiers of neighbouring properties. However, this in itself does not indicate a lack of harm arising from the proposal.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given, I hereby dismiss the appeal.

K Winnard

INSPECTOR