

---

# Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 October 2017

**by J A B Gresty MA MRICS**

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

**Decision date: 09 November 2017**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/Q0505/D/17/3181198**  
**100 Union Lane, Cambridge CB4 1QB**

- 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 & Mrs A Davison against the decision of Cambridge City Council.
  - The application Ref 17/0286/FUL, dated 18 February 2017, was refused by notice dated 6 July 2017.
  - The development proposed is construction of a single-storey front porch.
- 

## Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

## Main Issue

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

## Reasons

3. The appeal property forms part of a terrace of two-storey houses. The houses in the terrace appear to be evenly spaced in pairs, with the front doors of each pair standing close to one another. Noticeable features of the terrace include strings of decorative brickwork which run the length of the terrace and the pairs of ground floor windows with distinctive carved central mullions. Cumulatively these features contribute to the terrace having an attractive, designed and regular appearance which contributes positively to the character and appearance of this part of Union Lane.
4. The proposed porch would project about 1.2 metres from the front of the appeal property and would be about 1.3 metres wide, spanning little more than the width of the front door. Whilst the footprint of the porch would be about as small as it could practically be to fulfil its intended function, the porch would project forward over half of the depth of the property's small front garden with the front of the porch standing about 1.1 metres from the pavement. Consequently the porch would appear large in relation to the appeal property's own plot when viewed from the road.
5. The porch would stand adjacent to the front door of 102 Union Lane and would inevitably disrupt the symmetry of the Nos 100 and 102 when viewed from the road. Also, whilst the brickwork of its external walls would complement that of the main building, the porch's mono-pitch lean-to roof would obscure the decorative brickwork above the existing front door, resulting in disruption of

the regular and designed appearance of the appeal property and terrace as a whole.

6. There are examples of front porches nearby on the host terrace and other terraces of dwellings. However, in the main these do not complement the character and appearance of their host properties. In particular the mono-pitch, lean-to design of most of the porch roofs give many of the porches a bulky appearance which fail to reflect the design or character of their respective terraces.

## **Conclusions**

7. At the heart of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), there is a presumption in favour of sustainable development. Good design is a key aspect of sustainable development and it should contribute positively to making places better for people. In this case the proposed porch would enhance the living conditions of the occupiers of the appeal property and would be likely to help to reduce heat loss from the appeal property. Although there may be other practical ways to improve the heat retention of the front door area of the appeal property, in these respects the development would represent sustainable development as sought by the Framework.
8. Whilst there are examples of other porches nearby, in the main these do not contribute positively to the character or appearance of their respective buildings or the local area as a whole. Accordingly, in this case, the presence of other mono-pitch and flat-roofed porches in the local area does not add significant weight in favour of the proposed development. The proposed porch would be a prominent and incongruous feature which would detract from the character and appearance of the appeal property and terrace as a whole. In this respect the proposed development would not represent sustainable development as sought by the Framework.
9. Overall, the appeal property and the terrace as a whole is an attractive feature which contributes positively to the character and appearance of this part of Union Lane. The proposed porch would result in noticable harm to the designed and regular appearance of the terrace with consequential harm to the character and appearance of this part of Union Lane. Therefore, on balance and for the above reasons, I conclude that overall the porch would not represent sustainable development as sought by the Framework and it would fail to meet the aims of good design required Policies 3/4 and 3/7 of the Cambridge Local Plan. Accordingly I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

*J A B Gresty*

INSPECTOR