



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 June 2022

by Nichola Robinson BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 30th June 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/Q0505/D/22/3298036

17 Brookfields, Cambridge CB1 3NW

- 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 Mrs Monica de Lucena Rigat against the decision of Cambridge City Council.
 - The application Ref 20/04314/HFUL, dated 21 October 2020, was refused by notice dated 7 February 2022.
 - Proposed ground floor single storey rear extension partly replacing the existing. Roof conversion with extensions.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for ground floor single storey rear extension partly replacing the existing. Roof conversion with extensions at 17 Brookfields, Cambridge CB1 3NW in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 20/04314/HFUL, dated 21 October 2020, and the plans submitted with it.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed rear dormer windows on the character and appearance of the existing building and the Mill Road Conservation Area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is an end of terrace property located in the Mill Road Conservation Area which is characterised by 19th century terraced properties with shallow slate roofs. I understand that the appeal property, and the row of dwellings in which it is located, are 'Positive Unlisted Buildings' which make a positive contribution to the special interest of the conservation area and thereby its significance. The boundary of the conservation area runs along the rear of the site. Views of the rear elevation of the property from the public domain are limited to those between dwellings on Natal Road to the rear of the site, which itself lies outside of the conservation area, and limited views between properties on Montreal Road, which is within the conservation area. Given the limited visibility of the rear elevation. It appears that the positive contribution the appeal property makes to the setting of the conservation area relates to the uniform and unaltered appearance of the building frontages, as opposed to the rear elevation and rear roofscape.
4. The roof extension is large but retains some of the original roof form of the host dwelling and is set in at the edges of the roof. Consequently, the original roof form is still legible. The dormer windows are appropriate in materials and

- design and do not dominate the roof slope or the host building. The bulk of the extension is minimised through the incorporation of smaller pitched roof dormers which break up the massing of the extension.
5. The appeal proposal would disrupt an intact terrace roofscape to the rear elevation. However, views of the dormer windows from within the conservation area are limited, and the effect of this disruption is minimal. Consequently, the positive contribution the appeal property makes to the special interest and the character and appearance of the conservation area is not compromised because of this proposal.
 6. Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires the decision maker, in considering whether to grant planning permission for development which affects a conservation area, to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of land in a conservation area. For the reasons set out above I consider that the proposal would not compromise the character or appearance of the conservation area and would not result in harm to its significance.
 7. For these reasons I conclude that the proposed dormer windows do not have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the existing building or the Mill Road Conservation Area. I therefore find no conflict with those aims of Local Plan policies 55 and 58 and Appendix E (Roof Extensions Design Guide) of the Local Plan 2018 which seek to ensure that development is reflective of existing building forms and sympathetic to the surrounding area, and that roof extensions relate well to the proportions, roof form and massing of the existing house and neighbouring properties.
 8. As the development has been carried out there is no need for any additional conditions to be imposed.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons set out above, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Nichola Robinson

INSPECTOR