



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/21/3279642

32 Matthew Wren Close Little Downham Ely CB6 2UL

- 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 Jon Turrell against the decision of East Cambridgeshire District Council.
 - The application Ref 20/01549/FUL, dated 17 November 2020, was refused by notice dated 15 June 2021.
 - The development proposed is a two storey front extension with internal and external alterations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a two storey front extension with internal and external alterations at 32 Matthew Wren Close Little Downham Ely CB6 2UL in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 20/01549/FUL, dated 17 November 2020, 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: 2008-E-001 Rev B, 2008-P-001 Rev B, 2008-P-003 Rev D, 2008-P-002 Rev D, 2008-E-000 Rev A, 2008-E-002 Rev A, and 2008-E-003 Rev A.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Procedural Matters

2. The description of the development in the banner heading above is based on that used in the decision notice. For clarity I have used that in preference to the description on the original application form as it is more succinct.
3. 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

4. The main issue in the appeal is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area.

Reasons

5. The appeal property, No 32 Matthew Wren Close (No 32) is a detached property sited to the south of the Little Downham Conservation Area (CA). No 32, and its neighbouring property, No 34 are at the end of a row of similar detached properties, all of which have a gradual set back from its neighbouring property. However, Nos 32 and 34 differ from the remainder of the properties on this part of the road in that they are sited in a far cul-de-sac corner location with their front elevations at a significant set-back, equivalent to the whole depth of the property at No 30 Matthew Wren Close. As a consequence, Nos 32 and 34 are not in sequence with the line of properties on this part of the road and views of No 32 are particularly limited.
6. The proposed design of the front extension would materially alter the appearance of No 32. I appreciate the Council's concern that the resultant extension would result in a substantially larger dwelling. However, this does not automatically equate to harm. The extension would be of a good design and part of the front façade would be retained with the new front projection less than two thirds across the width of the front of the dwelling. The set back between the ground and first floor elevations would also reflect the original design of the dwelling. In addition, the use of a pitched roof, set at a lower level than the main roof, would reduce the scale of the extension and break up the mass of the front elevation. These aspects would mitigate the sense of scale of the extension.
7. I appreciate that the use of pitched roof front extensions are not a significant feature elsewhere in the locality. Nonetheless due to the set back distances in this location, the design would not sit uncomfortably with the design of other dwellings on Matthew Wren Close. The resulting development would be closer to the highway but given the depth of the set back would still be behind the main two storey front elevation of No 30. Given its juxtaposition with the majority of residential dwellings on Matthew Wren Close, the proposed extension would not be readily visible in wider views along the road. Closer views of No 32 would be limited and the extension would be seen as having a similar set back to the other properties on the road. As such it would not appear as an unduly prominent feature and would not be visually intrusive in the street scene.
8. I therefore conclude that the proposal would not have an adverse impact on the character and appearance of the area and would be of an appropriate scale and form to the host dwelling. Accordingly there is no conflict 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. It would also be in accordance with the East Cambridgeshire District Council Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document which provides that an extension should not compete in any way

with the host dwelling. Nor would it conflict with the Framework which encourages good design and seeks to promote development sympathetic to local character. Due to the extension being sited at the front of the property and the location of No 32, outside of and, to the south of the CA, the proposal would not result in any harm to the CA.

Other Matter

9. I note that the Council has no concerns in relation to the amenity or privacy of the occupiers of adjacent dwellings. Given the separation and set back distances between neighbouring dwellings I would agree with this assessment.

Conclusion and Conditions

10. Accordingly I allow the appeal. 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.

K Winnard

INSPECTOR