



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 June 2023

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

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12 July 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/W0530/D/23/3317572

72 High Street, Harlton, Cambridge CB23 1ES

- 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 Charlotte Haldane against the decision of South Cambridgeshire District Council.
 - The application Ref: 22/03218/HFUL, dated 14 July 2022, was refused by notice dated 15 December 2022.
 - The development proposed is the demolition of existing conservatories and the erection of part two-storey, part first floor rear extension with Juliet balconies.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The proposed development, as described on the application form, is for '*proposed extension works*'. The local planning authority (LPA) describes it as for '*the demolition of existing conservatories and the erection of part two-storey part first floor rear extension with Juliet balconies*'. I have used the latter description in the banner heading as it more concisely describes the proposed development.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal upon the setting of the adjoining Grade II listed buildings.

Reasons

4. The appeal building is sited next to No's 76 (Sunnyside) and 78 (Combe Cottage) which are Grade II listed (LBs). They date from the eighteenth century and are one and a half storeys in height and have tiled roofs. They are small scale, vernacular, simple buildings.
5. Their setting includes outbuildings and structures, but which are small in terms of height and scale, and therefore allow the limited heights and dimensions of the LBs to be appreciated when seen from High Street. I acknowledge that such an appreciation is mainly regarding the elevations facing directly onto High Street, but views of other elevations, especially when viewed from an easterly direction, are also possible, and the overall effect is to add positively and significantly to their setting. I afford special regard to the desirability of preserving the setting.

6. The appeal property already has a single storey extension to the rear. The proposed development is to redevelop it with a part two-storey/part first floor rear extension. While this would be hidden from view when seen immediately in front of the appeal property and from most of High Street, it would be seen from High Street when approaching from the east, albeit obliquely. Nonetheless, by its extra height and bulk and also by its closeness to the LBs, it would cause substantial harm to their setting, as described above.
7. While the LPA is concerned that the proposal differs in its window design, in its overall appearance and use of external materials from the LBs, I consider that such issues could have been controlled by the imposition of a planning condition. However, this would not overcome the harm that would be caused to the setting of LBs arising from my other conclusions above.
8. In the context of paragraph 202 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2021 (the Framework), the harm caused to the significance of the designated heritage assets would be less than substantial. There are no identified public benefits that would outweigh the less than substantial harm.
9. Therefore, I conclude that the proposed development would not accord with policies HQ/1 and NH/14 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018, or with paragraphs 195 and 202 of the Framework, which require development to sustain and enhance historic assets including their settings.

Other Matters

10. My attention has been drawn to an approval for a two-storey rear extension granted in 1983. However, it has long since lapsed and it also pre-dates the current development plan and the Framework., I have determined the appeal upon its individual planning merits and in accordance with the development plan and the Framework.
11. The appellant refers to the terms of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended) and the possible extensions which might be constructed under its provisions. However, I have no evidence before me of any such plans, nor of any reasonable likelihood that such permitted development might proceed.
12. The appellant considers that the proposed development would include a public benefit in that the property would be well maintained. However, I see no reason to conclude that the property is in danger of falling into disrepair or that this would constitute a public as distinct to a private benefit.
13. None of the above matters outweigh my findings on the main issue.

Conclusion

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

S. Hartley

INSPECTOR