



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 November 2024

by R Jones BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27 November 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/H0520/D/24/3348371

6 Springfield Close, Buckden PE19 5UR

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Tomas Polis against the decision of Huntingdonshire District Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/00570/HHFUL.
 - The development proposed is erection of single storey rear extension with first floor side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The appeal proposal is the same as an application previously approved by the Council (23/00874/HHFUL) save a change in the proposed external materials. The main issue in this case is therefore the effect of the proposed external materials on the character and appearance of the host dwelling, and surrounding area.

Reasons

3. No.6 Springfield Close (No.6) is a two-storey link detached dwelling located in the corner of an off-shoot cul-de-sac which projects north from the main part of Springfield Close. I observed that Springfield Close is characterised by link detached dwellings of a generally uniform design and appearance, constructed in an attractive buff brick with a feature darker, slightly recessed, brick panel below the first floor window on the front elevation.
4. The proposal is for the ground floor of the front elevation of No.6 to be finished in a light-coloured render and the first floor (existing elevation and side extension) to be finished in an antique coloured slatted cladding. I note that it is proposed to retain a buff brick at first floor to the side elevation in order to create a more subtle transition and to reduce the dominance of the new materials within the streetscene. However, the proposal would result in the loss of all the existing buff brick, and the feature panel, and would appear starkly different to the original dwelling; the transition would not be subtle.
5. I have had regard to the concerns of the appellant that the replacement and relocation of doors and windows could risk unsightly, patchy brickwork, but I observed that some of the windows within the front elevation have already

been replaced without issue. Further, I am not persuaded that the alterations and first floor extension could not be tied into the existing brickwork, and therefore the need for the total render and cladding of the front elevation of the host dwelling avoided.

6. Although located in the corner of a spur, I observed on my site visit that all of the front elevation of No.6 is visible from the junction with the main part of Springfield Close. Rather than making a positive contribution to variety and character in the streetscene, I find that the proposed external materials would appear an unduly dominant, incongruous addition. It would cause harm to the uniform appearance of the streetscene, the existing brick finishes positively contributing to its character rather than appearing monotonous.
7. The appellant has provided various examples in Buckden where materials (other than brick) have been used, and I observe from the photographs submitted in the evidence that some have been more successful than others in integrating within the immediate streetscene. I accept that the use of render and cladding can be an appropriate design approach and is often used to modernise a dwelling. However, I have assessed this case on its individual merits and context and find the proposed materials would cause harm to the character appearance of the host dwelling, and surrounding area.
8. Consequently, the appeal proposal conflicts with policies LP11 and LP12 of the Huntingdonshire Local Plan to 2036 (2019) which together require development to be well-designed, respond positively to its context and contribute to the area's character and identity. It would further conflict with the principles of good design in the National Planning Policy Framework and National Design Guide (2021).

Conclusion

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

R. Jones

INSPECTOR