



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 May 2022

by D J Barnes MBA BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Housing, Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 5 December 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/W0530/D/22/3295690

21 Priory Road, Horningsea CB25 9JL

- 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 Mrs Katherine Restif against the decision of South Cambridgeshire District Council.
 - The application Ref 21/04437/HFUL, dated 6 October 2021, was refused by notice dated 1 March 2022.
 - The development proposed is the demolition of existing rear extension and construction of a two storey rear extension and single storey front extension.
-

This decision is issued in accordance with Section 56(2) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (as amended) and supersedes the decision issued on 25 June 2022

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. It is considered that the main issues are the effects of the proposed developments on (a) character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area and (b) the living conditions of the occupiers of 23 Priory Road.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

3. The appeal property is a 2-storey semi-detached dwelling with a single storey rear addition which is located on the edge of Horningsea. As with some other dwellings fronting Priory Road, the rear elevation faces towards the open countryside which is Green Belt. No. 23 Priory Road, which is the other semi-detached dwelling, has been significantly altered by side and rear extensions.
4. The proposed development includes the replacement of the rear addition by a 2-storey extension whereby the ground floor flank wall would be sited close to the shared boundary with No. 23. The proposed first floor side elevation would be set back from this boundary. The other first floor side elevation would be similarly offset from the ground floor flank wall. When compared to the host property, the footprint of the resulting property would be greater because of the proposed development. However, the increase in the depth of the footprint

- would be modest in scale and would not alone amount to a reason for this appeal to fail.
5. When assessed as a whole, the proposed development at the rear would represent a significant increase in the floorspace of the host property. The scale of the proposed extension would be similar to the alterations undertaken to No. 23 and other near-by neighbouring dwellings. By reason of these other schemes, and although the scale of the proposed rear extension would not reflect the modest size of this altered host property, this matter alone would also not be a reason for this appeal to fail.
 6. From the adjacent Green Belt, the rear element of the appeal scheme would be viewed against the context of the host property, the enlarged No. 23 and the other altered dwellings. Accordingly, the proposed development would not be a conspicuous form of development which would amount to an unacceptable visual intrusion. For these reasons, the appeal scheme would not have an adverse effect on the rural character and openness of the Green Belt and, as such, there would not be a conflict with Policy NH/8 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018 (LP).
 7. However, at first floor level the design of the proposed rear extension, including its roof, appears to be contrived and has been determined by avoiding an unacceptable impact on the outlook from, and light levels received by, the habitable room windows of the neighbouring properties. The design of the proposed extension does not reflect the simple form of the host property and this would be accentuated by the first floor element being offset from the centre of the property's rear elevation.
 8. Further, the proposed choice of external materials for the rear extension would not reflect or complement the traditional materials of the host property. The concerns about the choice of external materials apply to the proposed front extension but the modest size of this addition and the design of other porches mean this would not be a reason for this appeal to fail.
 9. In combination, it is concluded the design, scale, form and external materials of the proposed rear extension would not be of high quality of the type sought by LP Policy HQ/1. Accordingly, the proposed development would cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area. The high quality design requirements are echoed in the guidance contained in the Council's Supplementary Planning Document: *District Design Guide* (SPD). LP Policy S2 is directed at the plan's objectives rather than being of direct relevance to the design quality of the proposed development.

Living Conditions

10. Adjacent to the shared boundary with No. 23 is the existing side elevation of the appeal property's rear addition. The length of this wall would be increased by the proposed rear extension at ground floor level. This increase in the length of the wall would be noticeable from the rear ground floor opening and adjacent patio area. However, the height of this wall would not exceed 3 metres and the main outlook from the opening and patio area of No. 23 would remain towards the rear garden and the open countryside beyond.

11. As identified, the first floor side elevation of the proposed rear extension would be set back from the shared boundary and, as such, it would not be a visually dominant or overbearing form of development when viewed from the ground floor patio window and patio area at the rear of No. 23.
12. On this issue it is concluded that the proposed development would not cause significant harm to the living conditions of the occupiers of 23 Priory Road and, as such, it would not conflict with LP Policy HQ/1 which seeks to protect the amenity of occupiers, or the guidance contained in the SPD concerning living conditions matters, including the outlook and day/sunlight implications of schemes.

Conclusion

13. Although significant harm would not be caused to the living conditions of the occupiers of 23 Priory Road this matter is significantly and demonstrably outweighed by the unacceptable harm caused to the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area. Accordingly, it is concluded that this appeal should be dismissed.

D J Barnes

INSPECTOR