



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 February 2023

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: 20th March 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/H0520/D/22/3312357

6 Stevenson Court, Eaton Ford, Cambridgeshire PE19 7LF

- 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 and Mrs Fenton against the decision of Huntingdonshire District Council.
 - The application Ref 22/00479/HHFUL, dated 2 February 2022, was refused by notice dated 27 September 2022.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a side/front/rear extension to the first floor.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. It is considered that the main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and the streetscene.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a 2-storey detached dwelling fronting the south side of a cul-de-sac. The dwellings along this side of the road are similarly designed with roofs sloping towards the road with their eaves being parallel to the road, hanging tiles at first floor level and single storey front projections of varying sizes. Similar characteristics are shared by the dwellings fronting the north side of the road.
4. Although some examples 2-storey flank walls adjacent to the shared boundaries exist, there are physical and visual gaps between the dwellings, particularly at first floor level above single storey garages. The difference in the ground level of the dwellings also assists with their individual identity and visual separation within the streetscene. There are some gable roof form style projections from the front elevations of dwellings at ground floor level, including the host property. However, such projections are not at first floor level.
5. The proposed development includes an extension above the existing garage which would project forward of the property's first floor front elevation and would possess a gable roof. This projecting extension forward of the property's first floor would represent an incongruous form of development which would not positively reflect the context, character and appearance of the streetscene. Further, the proposed gable roof form associated with the projecting extension

- would not respect the predominant roof form of the dwellings fronting the road, including the host property.
6. The proposed development would erode the physical and visual gap between the extended property and 4 Stevenson Court. However, because of the level difference between these dwellings they retain their individual identity and there would not be a significant terracing effect. However, the limited terracing effect does not outweigh the unacceptable harm which has been identified.
 7. In assessing the appeal scheme account has been taken of other side extensions, including 16 Stevenson Court and some of the dwellings fronting Milton Avenue, which were observed during the site visit. The full planning circumstances of these other extensions have not been provided and, for this reason, only limited weight is given to these other schemes in the determination of this appeal.
 8. For the reasons given, it is concluded that the proposed development would cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the host property and the streetscene and, as such, it would conflict with Policies LP11 and LP12 of the Huntingdonshire Local Plan to 2036. Amongst other matters, these policies refer to proposals being supported where they demonstrate that they respond positively to their context and have drawn inspiration from the key characteristics of their surroundings, including the built environment, and positively contribute to the character and identity of an area. Securing high quality design based on an understanding of an area is also sought by the Council's *Huntingdonshire Design Guide Supplementary Planning Guidance* and the National Design Guide. Accordingly, it is concluded that this appeal should be dismissed.

D J Barnes

INSPECTOR