



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 March 2023

by S. Hartley BA (Hons) Dist.TP (Manc) DMS MRTPI MRICS

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 4th April 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/W0530/D/23/3316092

21 Royston Road, Whittlesford, Cambridgeshire CB22 4NW

- 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 Ms. Sara Baker against the decision of South Cambridgeshire District Council.
 - The application Ref:22/04182/HFUL, dated 22 September 2022, was refused by notice dated 5 December 2022.
 - The development proposed is a two-storey extension to the front and rear of the existing semi-detached house.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the development upon the character and appearance of the host property and the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is located within a residential area of mainly single and two-story dwellings, set back from Royston Road sufficiently to provide off-road parking within their amenity areas. Dwellings have different designs, though there is a pleasant unity to the area provided by mature landscaping and a generally comparable building line. There is a preponderance of dual pitched roofs.
4. The appeal property forms one of a pair of semi-detached dwellings, visible from the main road. Like its neighbouring properties, it remains largely unchanged from its original construction. The pair of semi-detached houses largely mirror each other in terms of their generally balanced appearance. The design symmetry adds positively and distinctively to their overall character and appearance and that of the immediate area.
5. The proposed development would incorporate an extension to the front elevation. Whilst it would not extend as high as the existing ridge line of the host property, it would nevertheless adversely affect the symmetrical and balanced design of the pair of semi-detached houses. This would be exacerbated by the window design which would conflict, in terms of its height,

shape and location, with the windows in the existing dwelling. The overall effect would be to cause material harm to the existing character and appearance of the pair of dwellings and the immediate area.

6. The proposed extension would include a rear and side extension which, at first floor level, would extend beyond the existing gable to the dwelling. A similar first floor overhang would be incorporated into the proposed extension to the rear.
7. Whilst these elevations would be less conspicuous than the proposed front elevation, they would nevertheless adversely affect the symmetry and balance of the existing dwellings. This would be especially the case regarding the side elevation which would be visible from Royston Road.
8. For the above reasons, I find that that the proposed development, by its overall design and appearance, would detract from the character and appearance of the host property and that of the adjacent area. Therefore, I conclude that the proposed development would conflict with policies S/2, and HQ1 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018 which require good design. For the same reasons, it would not accord with paragraphs 128, 130 and 134 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2021. The LPA has referred in its decision notice to LP policy S/7 which relates to development within and without 'development frameworks', but it is not made clear how the policy relates to the proposed development. On the evidence that is available to me, I do not find that this policy is of direct relevance to the main issue.

Other Matters

9. The appellant has referred to other designs for extensions in the area. However, I am unaware of the circumstances which led to these developments being constructed. In any event, I have determined the appeal upon its individual merits and based on the effect of the proposed development upon the host property and immediate area. I find that this matter does not therefore alter or outweigh my conclusion on the main issue.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons outlined above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

S. Hartley

INSPECTOR