



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 August 2023

by Nick Bowden BA(Hons) Dip TP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18 September 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/W0530/D/23/3325730

21 Abbots Way, Horningsea, Cambridgeshire CB25 9JN

- 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 Archer against the decision of South Cambridgeshire District Council.
 - The application Ref 23/01258/HFUL, dated 31 March 2023, was refused by notice dated 25 May 2023.
 - The development proposed is for the demolition of existing garage, and proposed extensions and alterations to a dwelling house.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The development proposed is described as the demolition of existing garage, and proposed extensions and alterations to a dwelling house. I have noted the history of the site, and that many of the extensions and alterations have been permitted (Ref 22/04444/HFUL) and partially implemented. The part of the development in contention relates to what the Council have referred to as a second storey element. The appellant also refers to this in their statement. This is however noted as the first floor on the appellants plans. I have regarded these as the same in this decision.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the second storey element on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. Abbots Way comprises a small estate of detached houses leading off Priors Road. The houses are of a similar style, but a variety of two storey houses and chalet bungalows, some of which have been altered or extended. Many houses, including number 21, feature a recessed two storey element to one side. This appears to be part of the original design for this type of house.
5. Number 21 occupies a prominent position at the entrance to the estate from Priory Road. A position which is reinforced by each of numbers 23 to 29 being set slightly further back thus adding greater emphasis to number 21 on the corner.
6. The second-floor extension would be on this prominent corner. The extension attempts to replicate recessed elements to other homes including the one on

the opposite side of the host dwelling. However, the extension is deeper and wider.

7. The size of the second storey element of the extension would appear overbearing and dominant on this prominent corner. It is set slightly back from the front of the existing dwelling and benefits from a marginally lower ridge line. These features are insufficient for it to be regarded as subordinate given its prominent corner position. They are further unaided by a lack of articulation; albeit using matching materials. The extension would be a bold and bulky addition on the entrance to the cul-de-sac to the detriment of the character and appearance of the area.
8. My attention has been drawn to numbers 22 and 29 that have side projecting elements. Neither of these have extensions or recessed projections on their opposite sides, unlike the appeal scheme. They are also narrower and adjoin open fields such that they are not prominent in the street scene.
9. The property is on a larger plot, but much of this additional size is confined to the front garden due to the slightly staggered pattern of houses on this side of the street. I note references to landscaping and existing vegetation breaking up the mass of the extension. However, there was no vegetation in place at the time of my site visit and given the proximity of the extension to the boundary, there seems little opportunity for this to be meaningfully introduced. In any case, this does not feature as part of the scheme before me.
10. I conclude that the proposed extension would be an overly large and dominant addition to the dwelling that would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the area. The development does not comply with policy HQ/1 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018 which promotes high quality design that makes a positive contribution to its context.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Nick Bowden

INSPECTOR