



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 May 2022

by Benjamin Clarke BA (Hons.) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 31 May 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/W0530/W/21/3286033

50 High Street, Willingham CB24 5ES

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a failure to give notice within the prescribed period of a decision on an application for planning permission
 - The appeal is made by Mr Andrew Passmore against South Cambridgeshire District Council.
 - The application Ref 21/01799/HFUL, is dated 20 April 2021.
 - The development proposed is a two-storey rear and side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for a two-storey rear and side extension at 50 High Street, Willingham CB24 5ES in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 21/01799/HFUL, dated 20 April 2021, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 001 Rev. B; 002 Rev. B; 005 Rev. D; and 006 Rev. C
 - 3) No development shall take place above ground level until details of the external materials to be used in the construction of the development have been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal site consists of a dwelling located in a predominantly urban area. Buildings in the surrounding area are typically constructed to differing design and palettes of materials. This creates a varied character. This is also reflected in the appearance of the appellant's dwelling
4. The proposed development would feature a rear and side extension, including a cantilevered section to the side of the dwelling. Whilst this is not a feature present in the surrounding area or the appeal site, it would be viewed alongside buildings with differing architectural detailing and layouts. In addition, the appellant's dwelling features a variety of roof shapes, materials

and fenestration. Therefore, the proposed development would contribute to a pre-existing mixed character, rather than erode it.

5. The proposed development includes a cantilevered section. This section, and the rest of the extension, would be viewed alongside several other projecting elements on the appellant's dwelling. Therefore, owing to the varied projecting elements and different roof shapes, the proposed development would not erode a linear character within the appeal site.
6. The proposed development would include an extension to the rear. Whilst this adds to the massing of the building, the current dwelling features a variety of projecting elements to the rear of the building. These have been constructed to varying height and designs. Therefore, the proposed extension, when viewed alongside these differently designed additions, would not appear incongruous.
7. In addition, the scale of the proposed development would harmonise with the proportions of the existing dwelling on account of the proportions of the dwelling. This includes various projecting elements. Amongst other points, these include significant heights and differing projections.
8. Whilst parts of the proposed development would be constructed from materials that would be different from the existing dwelling. However, the appellant's existing dwelling has been constructed from a variety of materials, this includes different types, colours and textures. This variety is also reflected on other buildings within the vicinity of the appeal site. In consequence, the proposed development would not appear discordant.
9. Owing to the pattern of development within the surrounding area, views of the proposed development would not occur on a frequent basis or of a significant proportion of the proposed development. This is due to the screening effect provided by a several nearby buildings.
10. Furthermore, views of the proposed development from neighbouring properties would typically take place at an oblique angle. This means that the development would not be readily perceptible from nearby properties. In consequence, the development would not be a prominent addition and would therefore not lead to a substantial change in the character of the building and area.
11. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would not have an adverse effect upon the character and appearance of the building. The development, in this regard, would comply with Policy HQ/1 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan (2018). Amongst other matters, this requires that developments be of high-quality design, with a clear vision as to the positive contribution the development will make to its local and wider context.

Conditions

12. In addition to the standard implementation condition, a condition specifying the approved plans is necessary in the interests of precision. Although I have not found that harm would emanate from the proposed building materials, a condition that enables the Council to approve details of the precise palette of materials is necessary in order to provide certainty regarding the effects on the character of the building.

Conclusion

13. For the preceding reasons, the proposed development would not have an adverse effect upon the character and appearance of the building. Accordingly, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed, and planning permission granted subject to conditions.

Benjamin Clarke

INSPECTOR