



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 July 2019

**by Graham Wyatt BA (Hons) MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 29 July 2019**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/Q0505/W/19/3227334**

**2 Springfield Road, Cambridge CB4 1AD**

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a failure to give notice within the prescribed period of a decision on an application for planning permission.
  - The appeal is made by Mr Richard Heeps against Cambridge City Council.
  - The application Ref 18/1779/FUL, is dated 12 November 2018.
  - The development proposed is described as "Renewal of existing permission for first floor extension (16/0711/FUL) and proposed second floor extension".
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Preliminary Matters

2. The site has been the subject of a previous appeal decision<sup>1</sup> which I have had regard to in consideration of the development before me. Although there is no formal decision from the Council it has indicated that had it been in a position to determine the application it would have refused permission. The Council raise concerns over the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area and the host property.

### Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.

### Reasons

4. The appeal site is an end of terrace property within a residential street of largely two storey properties. The end elevation of the building is clearly visible from its position on the prominent corner of Milton Road/Mitcham's Corner and Springfield Road. The proposal seeks to erect a first floor extension over an existing car port to create an additional bedroom and this particular element of the proposal is considered acceptable in terms of its impact on the host property and the character and appearance of the area.
5. Turning to the roof extension over the existing two storey element to create a second floor bedroom, this has been reduced in height by some 1.3m through the replacement of its pitched roof with a flat roof. Nevertheless, the extension would add a significant amount of bulk to the building and while I acknowledge that the existing building has a flat roof element to its rear and that other flat

---

<sup>1</sup> APP/Q0505/D/18/3205995 dated 19 October 2018

roof extensions are in the vicinity, the second floor extension would be highly visible from the public realm. The flat roof would appear as a dominant, incongruous and discordant feature within the street scene, resulting in material harm to the character and appearance of the area and the host property.

6. Although I accept that flat roof dormer extensions exist on both 6 and 12A Springfield Road, these particular developments do not have the same prominence and impact on the street scene as the proposal before me. Moreover, I have considered this appeal on its own merits which is a fundamental principle that underpins the planning system.
7. Thus, the development would result in material harm to the host property and to the character and appearance of the area. It would be in conflict with Policies 55, 56, 58 and 59 of the Cambridge City Council Local Plan 2018 and the Council's adopted Roof Extension Design Guide 2003 which seek, amongst other things, to ensure that developments are appropriate to its context, help create distinctive and high quality places and relate well to the proportions of the existing house.

### **Conclusion**

8. For the above reasons, and having regard to the development plan when read as a whole, the appeal is dismissed.

*Graham Wyatt*

**INSPECTOR**