



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 September 2013

by **Philip Willmer BSc Dip Arch RIBA**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 1 October 2013

Appeal Ref: APP/W0530/A/13/2194340

Land to rear of 36 High Street, Barrington, Cambridgeshire, CB2 5QX.

- 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 Christopher Taylor against the decision of South Cambridgeshire District Council.
 - The application Ref S/1896/12/FL, dated 3 September 2012, was refused by notice dated 11 February 2013.
 - The development proposed is dwelling (revised design S/1609/10) "erection of bin store/cycle shed gravelled parking area."—subsequently withdrawn see "E" message to SCDC 14.2.13.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural matters

2. Planning permission was granted by the Council for a new dwelling on this site under its reference S/1609/10. I saw that the construction of the dwelling is substantially complete. However, the application, now the subject of this appeal, was for planning permission for a dwelling of a revised design to that approved, reference S/1609/10, and this was the basis on which the application was determined. Accordingly I shall consider this appeal on the same basis.
3. The description of the development given on the application form and set out in the bullet point above is neither precise nor succinct. I shall therefore adopt the description used by the Council when framing its decision notice '*dwelling (revised design S/1609/10)*'.
4. The application the subject of this appeal originally included for the erection of a bin store/cycle shed and gravelled parking area to the rear of the garage adjacent to The Old Guildhall. However, this part of the application was withdrawn before the application was determined by the Council and therefore will not form part of my determination here.

Main Issue

5. I consider the main issue in this case to be whether, having regard to the revised design, the appeal proposal would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Barrington Conservation Area.
-

Reasons

6. The appeal site is located to the rear of The Old Guildhall listed grade II and falls within the Barrington Conservation Area and Protected Village Amenity Area.
7. The approved design for the new dwelling was for a simple, two bedroom, one and a half storey gable ended building with a single storey flat roof side projection, along with a small workshop and bin store together with an area for external storage set under a flat glazed roof that served to link this group of single storey elements to the main house. The single storey projection contrasted with the main house by reason of the limited proportion of void to solid. Accordingly, it would have a subservient appearance that would not have detracted from the more robust gable ended form of the main dwelling.
8. The appellant proposes a first floor addition built above that projection to provide an extra bedroom. A larger workshop that would, in addition, be a utility room and store is also proposed along with minor alterations to the architectural detailing.
9. The first floor east side projection would have a pitched roof to reflect that of the main house. However, in order for the extension's ridge line to be set below that of the main house it would, as shown, be necessary to drop the eaves line so that it would not line through with that of the main roof. In my judgement, in this case, this would make for an awkward relationship between the main house and proposed addition that would significantly detract from the building's original simple well mannered design. Further, due to its pitched roof form the first floor addition would not appear subservient to the main house. Indeed, the first floor addition would double the width of the house at first floor level when viewed from the south and north and, even though the ridge line of the extension would be set down below that of the main house, the proposed addition would significantly increase the overall mass and scale of the dwelling.
10. The flat roof workshop/utility room building would in itself be a simple elegant structure. However, unlike the original design for the workshop it would be a stand alone structure which, due to its height in relation to the eaves line of the proposed extension and that of the proposed mono-pitched glass canopy over the kitchen door, would appear as an unrelated alien form of development. These changes while seemingly minor would nevertheless compromise the original architectural design to the detriment of the architectural integrity and quality of the finished house.
11. The Council has raised no objections to the minor alterations to the detailed design and from what I have seen and read I would concur with its findings. Nevertheless, I consider that the proposed alterations to the approved design in respect of the first floor addition, workshop and external storage area would materially denude the overall design quality of the new house as approved and now built. The revised proposal would therefore not accord with the objectives of The National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) and Policy DP/2 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Development Framework Development Control Policies Development Plan Document (2007) (LDF) which along with other things requires all new development to be of a high quality design.

12. The rear garden of The Old Guildhall as well as the area surrounding the new dwelling is heavily wooded. From my observations on site the new dwelling is therefore well screened from both the public right of way to the rear of the property, the garden of The Old Guildhall, neighbouring properties and the Green. While I appreciate that the screening effect of the trees will be less in the winter months, I do not believe that the property would be unduly prominent when viewed from the wider area. Nevertheless, due to the changes proposed to the original design, the appeal proposal would appear more dominant within its setting and therefore would serve to have a greater impact upon this part of the conservation area and thereby those limited views from outside the dwelling's curtilage.
13. I therefore conclude, in respect of the main issue, that the proposed development due to its design, bulk and massing would not be of a high quality design and thereby would cause harm to the character and appearance of the conservation area. It would therefore fail to accord with the aims of the Framework and LDF Policies DP/2 and CH/5 as they relate to the quality of development and the preservation or enhancement of the character or appearance of conservation areas.

Other matters

14. The Council has sought financial contributions towards the off-site provision and maintenance of open space, community facilities, and a waste receptacle contribution together with monitoring and legal fees. However, as the appeal is to be dismissed on its substantive merits, it is not necessary to address the need for an obligation in this case given that the proposal is unacceptable for other reasons.

Conclusions

15. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Philip Willmer

INSPECTOR