



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 February 2022

by Jonathan Edwards BSc(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 03 February 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/Q0505/W/21/3280336

7 Devonshire Road, Cambridge CB1 2BH

- 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 Dr Jerome Dilley against Cambridge City Council.
 - The application Ref 21/00009/HFUL, is dated 4 January 2021.
 - The development proposed is loft conversion.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for loft conversion with rear dormer at 7 Devonshire Road, Cambridge CB1 2BH in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 21/00009/HFUL, dated 4 January 2021, 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 development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: ELA/5 revision A, ELA/6 revision B, ELA/13 revision B and ELA/18 revision A.

Preliminary Matters

2. The description of development in the header is taken from the application form. The appeal form includes an amended description with reference to the rear dormer. As it is more accurate, I have used the revised description in my decision. The appeal drawings clearly show a new dormer and so I am satisfied that assessing the scheme on this basis would cause no injustice.
3. After the submission of the planning application, the appellant provided the Council with revised plans showing a pitched roof dormer rather than a flat roof. The appellant has requested the appeal be decided on the basis of the original plans. However, the Council's comments are based on the pitched roof scheme. Also, as the amended plans were accepted by the Council before the appeal was lodged, it would cause injustice to assess the scheme on the basis of the original plans. As such, my decision is based on the revised scheme.

Main Issues

4. The Council has made no formal decision on the planning application leading to this appeal. However, in light of its submissions, the main issues are the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host building and whether it would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Mill Road Conservation Area (the CA).

Reasons

5. The appeal property is a mid-terrace, 2 storey dwelling dating from the late nineteenth century. The main part of the house has a dual pitched roof with a ridge running parallel to the road. To the rear is a 2 storey high, pitched roof projection with a ridge shared with the neighbouring property and at right angles to the main roof ridgeline. The projection includes a chimney on the shared ridge and a strong gable end elevation, which are repeated in an attractive pattern to the rear of properties in the row.
6. The site lies in the CA which covers a wide urban area in the central of Cambridge. The CA's significance appears to at least partly derive from the historic and aesthetic interest of its buildings. Often, these have retained a simple, traditional style and appearance with rows of properties that display a marked degree of uniformity. The appeal property is very similar in terms of age, form and style to others along Devonshire Road and so in these regards it makes a positive contribution to the qualities of the CA.
7. The proposed conservation rooflights would be visible from the road. However, these would make little difference to the roof form and similar features have been added to nearby dwellings without detriment to the appearance of the street scene. As such, this element of the scheme would cause no harm to the qualities of the appeal property or the CA.
8. The rear dormer would be a more significant alteration to the roof, although it would be below the ridge of the main part of the house and so it would not be visible from the road. It would be seen from neighbouring properties but broad views would be prevented by vegetation and boundary features in back gardens as well as the screening effect of the rear projections on neighbouring properties. As such, the addition would have only a localised visual effect.
9. The dormer would be set in from the side to 8 Devonshire Road and its lower edge would be above and away from the eaves. The extension would continue down part of the rear projection and would protrude above its ridgeline. However, this element would be set well back from the projection's rear elevation so that it would not be conspicuous. Also, a significant part of the projection's roof form and its chimney would remain unaffected. As such, the dormer would relate well to the proportions of the house and its overall roof form. Moreover, its pitch roof would help avoid an insensitive boxy appearance.
10. Several nearby properties have rear dormers, although these tend to be to the main part of the roof rather than to rear projections. However, a similar extension to the proposal has been carried out to a property in St Barnabas Road that adjoins the appeal site to the rear. As such, the addition over the rear outlier would not be entirely peculiar to the area. Moreover, due to its localised visual effect, the enlargement to the rear projection would not be easily seen in the context of nearby properties. Therefore, it would avoid an obvious disruption to the regular pattern of roof forms to the rear of Devonshire Road houses. Consequently, the scheme would not meaningfully diminish the appeal property's contribution to the significance of the CA.
11. For these reasons, I conclude the development would cause no detriment to the character or appearance of the host property. Also, I conclude it would not harm and so it would preserve the character and appearance of the CA. In these regards, it would accord with Policy 61 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2018.

Amongst other things, this aims to ensure that developments, including alterations to roofs, complement the built form and either preserve or enhance the significance of heritage assets.

Conditions and Conclusion

12. To ensure the development is carried out in accordance with the submissions, I impose a condition that refers to the appeal drawings. For the reasons given, I conclude that the appeal should succeed.

Jonathan Edwards

INSPECTOR