



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 December 2024

By Terrence Kemmann-Lane JP DipTP FRTPI MCMI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 3 January 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/D0515/D/24/3351375

1 May Meadows, Doddington, March, PE15 0WJ

- 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 M Zivtins against the decision of Fenland District Council.
 - The application Ref is F/YR24/0400/F
 - The development proposed is the insertion of dormer roof extension including raising roof height of garage and single-storey element (to enable loft conversion for the creation of additional living accommodation) to existing dwelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the insertion of dormer roof extension including raising roof height of garage and single-storey element (to enable loft conversion for the creation of additional living accommodation) to existing dwelling at 1 May Meadows, Doddington, March, PE15 0WJ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref F/YR24/0400/F, 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 materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
 - 3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed development on the streetscene and the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

May Meadows is a short cul-de-sac that runs off Turf Fen Lane. The appeal site is at the junction of the 2 streets, and therefore highly visible on the main approach along Turf Fen Lane. The appeal dwelling is a detached 2-storey house with an 'L' shaped footprint. The 'L' shape is produced by a forward projecting element at right-angles to the main 2-storey part that aligns with May Meadows. The forward element begins with a study/bedroom and ensuite which links with a single-storey double garage to the front. The study/bedroom part has a ridgeline just below the eaves of the main house, whilst the garage has a raised ridgeline with 2 rooflights.

3. The proposed alterations include raising the ridge of both the domestic link part and the garage, but retain a small height difference between the two, the garage element being a little higher. The link part would have its ridge joining the front slope of the main roof of the house, a little way above the eaves. The loft conversion would create additional living accommodation in both parts.
4. The appeal proposal would increase the ridge height of the garage to 5.87 metres, whilst the link would be have a ridge height of 5.64m. I note that there is an extant permission, given in 2023, for the insertion of a dormer roof extension including raising the roof height of the garage to 5.5m. That permission did not include any alteration of the domestic link to the garage. I also note, as I saw at my visit, that each of the houses on May Meadows has a forward wing with garages at ground floor, with first floor accommodation in the roof space, one utilising dormers windows.
5. In this context, I cannot see that raising the height of the garage and the link would be harmful to the streetscene and the character and appearance of the area. The host dwelling is substantial, and the proposed alterations would not create a dominant or incongruous feature, but would be compatible with the scale and character of the existing dwelling, and its neighbours.
6. I have consider all other matters raised including the comments from neighbours. These appear to primarily relate to decisions taken at earlier stages when the house at No.1 May Meadows was first approved. The only implications for neighbours, particularly at No. 2, relate to the raising of the ridge and eaves heights. These are reasonably small increases with the roof pitches away from the that property, and there is a gap between 2 dwellings. I consider that there would be no significant additional impact on amenity of that neighbour. In respect of the proposed dormer windows, these would be hidden from No.2 and the other neighbours to the east.
7. For the reasons I have given, I consider that the appeal proposal is in conformity with the requirements of Policy LP16 – ‘Delivering and Protecting High Quality Environments across the District’, of Fenland Local Plan 2014. Therefore the appeal will be allowed.

Conditions

The statutory condition that provides a time limit on the start of development must be imposed. In addition, the council has suggested 2 conditions in the event that the appeal is upheld. I have considered these in the light of Planning Practice Guidance. These are that the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development shall match those used in the existing building, and that the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans. I agree that these conditions are necessary to ensure that the development permitted integrates with the existing in a visually satisfactory manner, and for certainty and avoidance of doubt as to the development permitted.

Terrence Kemmann-Lane

INSPECTOR