



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 December 2024

by M Chalk BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13 December 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/W0530/D/24/3347076

97 Duxford Road, Whittlesford, Cambridgeshire, CB22 4NJ

- 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 P Rogers against the decision of South Cambridgeshire District Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/01188/HFUL.
 - The development proposed is two and single storey side and rear extension with external moderations to glazing and doors.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for two and single storey side and rear extension with external moderations to glazing and doors at 97 Duxford Road, Whittlesford, CB22 4NJ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 24/01188/HFUL, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with drawing nos 002 Revision B, 008 Revision B, 009 Revision C, 010 Revision C, 011 Revision C and 012 Revision C.
 - 3) The external materials and finishes of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing dwelling.
 - 4) No development shall commence above slab level until details of the privacy screens to be fitted along the sides of the first floor balcony have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The screens shall be solid or obscure glazed and have a height of 1.7 metres above floor level to either end. The approved screens shall be fitted prior to the bringing into use of the balcony in accordance with the approved details and shall be maintained and retained thereafter.

Applications for costs

2. There is an application for costs made by Mr P Rogers against the council. This is the subject of a separate decision.

Main Issues

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is one of a row of detached houses extending along Duxford Road on the approach into Whittlesford. These houses are generally varied in size and appearance, with a mixture of external finishes and number of storeys. The houses are generally set away from their flank boundaries, but this varies significantly between individual properties.
5. No 97 had a single-storey side extension and garage built close to the shared boundary with No 99, although this had been demolished before my site visit. There is a substantial gap between the two houses that provides a clear view to the open space beyond them.
6. The proposed side extension, due to its height and width, would significantly reduce the gap between the properties. The boundary with No 99 is angled so that the appeal site narrows towards the rear. No 99 has extended up to the boundary, and this would result in some visual overlap between the existing and proposed extensions. However, the side extension to No 99 is only a single storey in height, with its roof pitched away from the boundary line. That extension is also set well back from the front of the house, reducing its prominence in the street scene.
7. The proposed side extension to the appeal property would be set a minimum of 1 metre away from the side boundary, but towards the front of the house this spacing would be much wider due to the angled boundary. The roof over the extension would be pitched away from the boundary and the forward two-storey element of No 99 is set away from the boundary. The houses toward this end of the row possess a greater degree of spaciousness around them than those further into Whittleford. However, the combination of these elements would retain an acceptable degree of separation between the two houses, given the wider context of the variable spacing between houses on this stretch of Duxford Road.
8. The extension roof would be set down from the ridgeline of the existing roof, with a shallower pitch to the front roof slope. It would also be set back from the front elevation. While these differences would be modest, they would ensure that the extension would be seen as a subordinate addition to the original house in the street scene.
9. The council has stated that there would be no harm from the proposed rear extensions. Given the lack of visibility in the wider area, I see no reason to disagree with this assessment.
10. The proposed development would therefore not be harmful to the character and appearance of the area. It would consequently accord with policy HQ/1 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan. This policy requires, amongst other criteria, that development be appropriate in terms of scale, siting and proportion in relation to the surrounding area.

Conditions

11. I have considered the council's suggested conditions and, where appropriate, amended the suggested wording in accordance with national guidance.
12. I have imposed conditions relating to the commencement of development and specifying the approved plans for the sake of certainty. To ensure that the

appearance of the development would be acceptable I have imposed a condition requiring that external finishes and materials match the existing house. I have also imposed a condition securing the provision and retention of privacy screens to prevent harmful overlooking of neighbouring properties.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons set out above the appeal is allowed.

M Chalk

INSPECTOR