



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 October 2023

by P B Jarvis BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 31 October 2023.

Appeal Ref: APP/H0520/D/23/3325688

12 Sheepfold, St Ives PE276 5FY

- 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 Derek Smith against the decision of Huntingdonshire District Council.
 - The application Ref 23/00514/HHFUL, dated 20 March 2023, was refused by notice dated 22 May 2023.
 - The proposed development is first floor extension above garage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the impact on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and wider street scene.

Reasons

3. The appeal site comprises a large, modern detached two storey dwelling. It is located within a residential street of similar size and style properties which have brick elevations with pitched roofs. The street scene is characterised by single storey double garages and entrance areas set forward of the dwellings though a few have garages set to the side. These single storey elements are relatively prominent features in the street scene though appear as subservient additions to the front of the dwellings. The road is also characterised by generally open but well landscaped front gardens with some mature trees such as those on the appeal site.
4. The dwelling on the appeal site is set back slightly further from the road frontage than its neighbouring property to the north, but considerably further back compared to its immediately adjoining neighbour to the south, no. 14. The forward sited garage on the appeal site is set only slightly closer to the road than the dwelling at No. 14 with the dwelling itself set wholly behind the rear elevation of this adjoining property.
5. The proposed first floor addition would extend almost to the front of the existing garage, set back a small distance such that the front elevation would be roughly level with the front elevation of No. 14. Therefore, whilst it would be a large addition, it would not project further forward than the established building line formed by No. 14 and the property adjoining to the south.

6. However, it would be of a significant scale and would largely have the same height as the host dwelling as a result of which, despite it being set back from the road frontage, it would appear disproportionately large when viewed within the street scene. This would be the case particularly in approaching the site along Sheepfold from the north, where the full extent of the first floor projection forward of the host dwelling would be evident. Furthermore, despite the fact that it would not extend any further forward than the adjoining two storey dwelling, it would introduce a built form that would be out of keeping with the established character as described above due to the forward projecting element failing to appear subservient to the host dwelling.
7. The Appellant has referred to the first floor extension over the existing garage at No. 14, but this garage is located to the side of this dwelling therefore does not compare with the current appeal proposal. The Appellant also contends that the design of the windows would be in keeping with the host dwelling, a point disputed by the Council. In my view the more contemporary approach taken in this regard would not be harmful to the host dwelling or wider street scene but it remains my view for the reasons set out above that the proposal as a whole would be unacceptable.
8. Overall, I find that the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and wider street scene. It would thereby conflict with Policies LP11 and LP12 of the Huntingdonshire Local Plan (2019) which seek development that responds and contributes positively to its context, successfully integrating with adjoining buildings to create distinctive and well-designed places. For the same reasons, it would also fail to satisfy guidance in the Huntingdonshire Design Guide SPD (2017) which seeks to ensure that extensions complement the form and character of the existing house and wider street scene.

Other Matters

9. The rear boundary of the appeal site shares a common boundary with the north eastern part of the St. Ives Conservation Area. I agree with the Council that the proposal would not have any harmful impact in this regard and the character and appearance of the conservation area would be preserved.

Conclusions

10. I therefore conclude that this appeal should be dismissed.

P B Jarvis

INSPECTOR