
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 August 2016

by Jonathan Price BA(Hons) DMS DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 19th September 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/Q0505/D/16/3155086

80 Shelford Road, Trumpington, Cambridge, CB2 9NF

- 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 John Stevens against the decision of Cambridge City Council.
 - The application Ref 16/0353/FUL, dated 24 February 2016, was refused by notice dated 16 May 2016.
 - The development proposed is to knock down existing lean-to extensions and build new rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The effect of the new rear extension on the character and appearance of the area and on the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers, with particular regard to privacy and outlook.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The extensions proposed would be quite large relative to the existing dwelling. However, there is adequate back garden space to accommodate these without the resulting development appearing cramped. As shown on the computerised projections and three-dimensional images submitted, these additions would be of a clean, contemporary design that could contrast successfully with the older house and provide for a visually acceptable result. There are already differing styles of development in this area, some of a similarly modern appearance.
 4. The actual drawings of this proposed extension lack detail beyond the basic shape and dimensions of what is proposed. There are no survey plans of the existing house to show how the extension would relate to the present structure or any floor plans showing the accommodation proposed. Furthermore, details of the windows and other external features would be necessary to evaluate how successful the final result would be.
 5. The visualisations provided of a large modern addition of this nature could be acceptable, subject to satisfactory detailed drawings. In the absence of these it is not possible to conclude that this proposal would satisfy policies 3/4, 3/7 and 3/14 of the Cambridge City Council Local Plan 2006 (LP), which seek that
-

extensions are of an attractive design, which respond positively to local character.

Living conditions of neighbouring occupiers

6. The large, projecting first-floor windows proposed to the rear would allow views over the side boundary of 5 Bishops Road and into the private back garden of this neighbouring bungalow. However, there would remain a sufficient distance between these rear-facing windows and the boundary of this neighbouring property not to cause an unacceptable loss of privacy to this adjacent rear garden space. Therefore, it is not considered that this proposal would result in material harm to the living conditions of these particular neighbours.
7. The neighbouring house at No 82 has a two-storey rear addition that this extension would be adjacent to, and project substantially beyond. This would result in an overbearing impact on the outlook from the adjacent first-floor bedroom window. Whilst the current occupiers have raised no objections it is necessary to consider the living conditions of future occupiers. The rearward extent of this addition would have an unduly overbearing impact on the outlook from the adjacent first-floor bedroom window and cause an unacceptable degree of harm to the living conditions provided for occupiers of this next-door house.
8. Because the rear extension would not preserve acceptable living conditions for the occupiers of the immediately neighbouring dwelling at No 82, the proposal would fail to comply with the aims of LP policies 3/4 and 3/14. These seek that extensions respond to the local context and do not visually dominate neighbouring properties.
9. The appellant has indicated that the extension could be reduced by some 15% to limit the impact on the outlook from the adjacent bedroom window at No 82. Revised plans submitted with an appeal can, in certain circumstances, be accepted. However, in this case, the lack of full plans of the changes proposed means such an amendment should be the subject of a fresh planning application to the Council. The appeal process should not be used to evolve a scheme and so this decision must relate to the proposals upon which the original refusal of planning permission was based.

Conclusion

10. The appellant has referred to a number of developments the Council has approved in this area and these have been considered. None of these are so similar to this proposal that they would provide a clear precedent lending it any material support. In any event, this scheme should be assessed on its own, individual merits.
11. For the reasons given, having taken into account all other matters raised, I conclude that this appeal should not succeed.

Jonathan Price

INSPECTOR