



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 June 2024

by A Hartley, LLB(Hons), Solicitor, MBA

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23 July 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/W0530/D/24/3342947

49 Parlour Close, Histon, Cambridgeshire, CB24 9XR

- 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 Shelton against the decision of South Cambridgeshire District Council.
 - The application Ref is 23/04662/HFUL.
 - The development proposed is a loft conversion with rear facing dormer and velux windows to front.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a loft conversion with rear facing dormer and velux windows to front at 49 Parlour Close, Histon, Cambridgeshire, CB24 9XR in accordance with the terms of the application reference 23/04662/HFUL subject to the following conditions:
 1. The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:

023053-PO2 Rev P1 Proposed Floor Plans and Elevations and 023053-PO3 RevP1 – Proposed Block Plan and Site Location Plan.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is situated in an established residential estate. It reads within a group of one and a half storey dwellings with distinctive steep pitched roofs containing front and rear dormers. This distinctive rhythm of roof scape design within the streetscape at the frontage contributes positively to the character of the area.
4. The proposed velux rooflights within the roof to the front would not appear intrusive in the streetscene and are therefore acceptable here. Due to the orientation of the neighbouring property at No.53, which is of different design

to the grouping, the proposed rear dormer would not be particularly visible from Parlour Close. Combined with its proximity to the different house design of No 53, any glimpsed views of the rear dormer from Parlour Close would not diminish the distinctive rhythm of steeply pitched roofs addressing Parlour Close. Therefore, its impact on the character of the area would be highly limited, confined mainly to private views from the rear of some neighbouring dwellings, and glimpsed from Narrow Close.

5. Although substantial, the proposed rear dormer is designed with a simplicity of form. Moreover, the proposed windows on the dormer would be arranged symmetrically and of proportions that would appear in keeping with the property as a whole. Therefore, whilst extending across the entire width of the first floor, it would appear as a neat, albeit bulky addition, from the rear garden and neighbouring gardens.
6. My attention has been drawn to a Certificate of Lawfulness confirming that an additional dormer could be added to the rear under permitted development rights. As the occupants are seeking to increase the amount of living space, there is a reasonable prospect that this would be carried out and I therefore consider this to be a legitimate fall-back position, to which I afford considerable weight. The design of the fall-back is marginally smaller than the appeal proposal. However, the two-step dormer design of the fall-back scheme would appear less streamlined than the appeal scheme and would create a less cohesive design solution. Accordingly, in the circumstances of this appeal, the fallback position would not be more favourable than the appeal scheme.
7. Consequently, although the rear dormer element of the proposal conflicts to some extent with Policy HQ/1 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan (2018), and policy HIM01 of the Histon and Impington Neighbourhood Plan (2021) in terms of the adverse impact of the rear roof form on the character and appearance of the area and the host dwelling, I have attached considerable weight to the fallback position in this case. I consider the appeal proposal would provide an improvement in design compared to the fallback position. This factor outweighs the conflict with the development plan in the particular circumstances of this case.

Conditions

8. I have had regard to the conditions suggested by the Council. I have not imposed a condition requiring matching materials, but I have imposed a condition specifying the approved plans, which set out the approved materials, as this provides certainty.

Conclusion

9. Having taken into account all representations made, for the reasons given above, I conclude that notwithstanding the conflict with the development plan policy, there are material considerations that outweigh the conflict and therefore the appeal should be allowed subject to conditions.

A Hartley

INSPECTOR