
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 March 2022

by Benjamin Clarke BA (Hons.) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 6th April 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/H0520/D/22/3291962

8 Honeydon Avenue, Eaton Socon PE19 8PJ

- 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 Tony Temple-Brown against the decision of Huntingdonshire District Council.
 - The application Ref 21/02123/HHFUL, dated 16 September 2021, was refused by notice dated 23 December 2021.
 - The development proposed is the raising of the garage roof by 1.5m to create room above.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue relevant to this appeal is the effect of the development upon the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site consists of a detached dwelling located in a residential area. In most instances, houses are located in line with one another. However, the appellant's dwelling, and the neighbouring house, have a projecting garage. the surrounding area is relatively level in nature and dwellings typically do not have substantial front boundary treatment.
4. The proposed development would result in an increase in the bulk and massing of the appellant's dwelling. This would be a particularly prominent owing to it being located at the front of the property. In addition, the extension would project beyond the principal elevation of the house. However, the proposed development would increase the height and bulk off the building which would give it a greater level of prominence than is currently the case.
5. In addition, the proposed extension would project beyond the established building line of neighbouring dwellings near to the appeal site in Honeydon Avenue. Whilst this projection might not be large, it would be a prominent alteration. In result, this projection would erode the linear form of development. Therefore, the proposal would be discordant.
6. In addition, by reason of the additional height created by the proposed development, the extension would not be a subordinate addition to the existing dwelling.

7. Whilst the appeal site features a garage which projects beyond the front elevation of some of the neighbouring dwellings. However, this garage, in its current form, has a smaller mass than the appeal scheme and therefore does not have the same effects as the appeal proposal would have.
8. I acknowledge that the appellant's dwelling is somewhat unusual in the vicinity owing to the fact that the garage projects beyond the front elevation of the dwelling. This contrasts with many other nearby properties where the garage is sited in line with the respective house. However, the dwelling in its current form is not overly dominant when viewed from the surrounding area.
9. The proposed development features some windows. However, whilst these would serve to punctuate the front elevation of the extension, they would not overcome the adverse effects arising from the massing of the development.
10. Owing to the relatively level topography, the predominantly straight nature of this section of the road and the fact that the relative lack of front boundary treatments in the vicinity means that the proposal would be readily perceptible from the surrounding area.
11. Furthermore, the extension would be visible from the junction between Honeydon Avenue and the Great North Road, as well as various points in Honeydon Avenue. In addition, there is a path that crosses Honeydon Avenue near to the appeal site. In result, the proposed development would also be apparent to users of this path. Therefore, the development has the potential to be experienced by a great number of people. In consequence, the proposed extension would be strident.
12. My attention has been drawn to other developments elsewhere. I do not have the full information regarding their planning circumstances before me, which lessens the weight that I can attribute to them. Nonetheless, I note that the existing extensions to which I have been referred are constructed to different designs to the appeal proposals; are located in areas where the surrounding buildings have different designs and siting; and, in some instances, are near to a greater amount of landscaping, which provides screening. Therefore, owing to these significant differences, I find that the presence of developments elsewhere does not allow me to disregard my previous concerns.
13. I conclude that the proposed development would have an adverse effect upon the character and appearance of the surrounding area. The development, in this regard, would conflict with the requirements of Policies LP11 and LP12 of the Huntingdonshire Local Plan (2019); and the Huntingdonshire Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (2017). Amongst other matters, these seek to ensure that new developments respond positively to its context and draw inspiration from the key characteristics of its surroundings; and enables the wider area to achieve a coherent and integrated built form.

Other Matter

14. The proposed development would result in improved living conditions for the appellant. Whilst this is a matter of note, it is only one of all the issues that must be considered. It therefore does not overcome, or outweigh, my findings in respect of the main issue.

Conclusion

15. The proposed development would have an adverse effect upon the character and appearance of the surrounding area. The scheme would therefore conflict with the development plan taken as a whole. There are no material considerations, including the National Planning Policy Framework, that indicate the decision should be made other than in accordance with the development plan. Therefore, for the preceding reasons, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Benjamin Clarke

INSPECTOR