



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 May 2022

by D J Barnes MBA BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25 June 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/Q0505/D/22/3294886

73 River Lane, Cambridge CB5 8HP

- 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 Drs Steve and Gwen Brierley against the decision of Cambridge City Council.
 - The application Ref 21/05543/HFUL, dated 17 December 2021, was refused by notice dated 22 February 2022.
 - The development proposed is the demolition of an existing single storey structure at the rear of the house and construction of a new single storey rear extension and new loft extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. It is considered that the main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a 2-storey dwelling at the end of a short terrace of 3 dwellings situated within a primarily residential area. The property is situated within the Riverside and Stourbridge Common Conservation Area where there is a statutory duty to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the area in determining this appeal. For alterations to a dwelling, this duty is echoed in Policies 58 and 61 of the Cambridge Local Plan (LP).
4. No appraisal of the character or appearance of the Conservation Area has been provided. However, from the observations made during the site visit this part of the Conservation Area is characterised by terraces of 2-storey dwellings fronting the roads with 2-storey outriggers at the rear which possess a lower ridge height than the main part of the property. The dwellings are of similar design, including gable roof forms, and constructed of similar materials.
5. There is a rhythm and regularity to the appearance of the terraces albeit there are rear roof extensions to some of the dwellings. These roof additions are not part of the short terrace within which the property is located and this terrace shares a consistency of appearance with the adjacent terrace fronting River Lane. Further, within the surrounding area, there are no obvious roof

- extension which include raising of the outrigger's ridge height with the alterations principally being confined to the rear roofslope of the main part of a dwelling.
6. The proposed development includes the erection of a roof extension which would comprise a mansard style dormer within the property's main roof slope and this would be sited to the rear of a parapet wall. A smaller addition to the outrigger is proposed which would include the existing roof ridge being increased in height. A chimney would be retained and would, from some locations, screen the increase in the ridge height of the outrigger's roof. This element of the proposed development would not be seen from the streets but would be viewed from the surrounding gardens, albeit there is screening from some adjacent properties associated with mature trees.
 7. The appellants claim that the proposed development would be an improvement when compared to the *Roof Extension Design Guide* contained in LP Appendix E. However, recognising that this is only guidance, this appeal has been assessed based upon its own planning circumstance rather than fully assessing the scheme against the *Design Guide*.
 8. By reason of scale, siting and design, especially the form of the mansard roof and the increase in the height of the outrigger's roof, the proposed roof extension would be an incongruous form of development which would fail to respect the character and appearance of either the host property, the terrace within which the property is located, the neighbouring terrace fronting River Lane and the surrounding residential Conservation Area. The proposed roof extension would not respond positively to its context as required by LP Policy 55. Although the external materials proposed would replicate those of the host property, this matter would not outweigh the identified adverse harm.
 9. There are other roof extensions within the surrounding area which are unsympathetic to the character and appearance of their host dwellings and the surrounding area. These other schemes do not represent precedents for allowing this appeal scheme, especially where their full planning histories have not been provided. They have been given limited weight in the determination of this appeal.
 10. For the reasons given, the appeal scheme would fail to preserve the character and appearance of the Conservation Area harm. Applying the test identified at paragraph 202 of the National Planning Policy Framework, there would be less than substantial harm caused to the significance of this designated heritage asset but any public benefit, including improvements to the thermal performance of the host dwelling, would not outweigh the harm which has been identified.
 11. No specific objections to the single storey rear extension have been raised by the Council and there are no reasons to disagree with this assessment. However, for the reasons given, it is concluded that this appeal should be dismissed because the proposed development would cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area and, as such, it would conflict with LP Policies 55, 58 and 61.

D J Barnes

INSPECTOR