



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/22/3297810

26 Norwich Street, Cambridge CB2 1NE

- 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 Joe Borrett against the decision of Cambridge City Council.
 - The application Ref 22/00180/HFUL, dated 17 January 2022, was refused by notice dated 14 March 2022.
 - The development proposed is a loft conversion
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed roof extension on the character and appearance of the existing building and the Newtown and Glisson Road Conservation Area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a two-storey end of terrace dwelling located on Norwich Street within the Newtown and Glisson Road Conservation Area. Norwich Street comprises unbroken rows of modest two storey pitched roof terraces which are of a similar height and design and appear to have undergone little alteration. This form and appearance of the rows of dwellings makes a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the conservation area, which also appears to be a key part of its significance. There is a gap between the appeal property and the neighbouring dwelling, 34 Norwich Street, and views of the side elevation of the appeal property, including the roof, can be gained from the street.
4. The proposed roof extension would incorporate 3 individual flat roof dormer windows with sliding sash windows, each set within a mansard roof. The resultant altered roof profile would be visible from the street. Whilst views of the raised side parapet wall would be limited to the area immediately surrounding the appeal property, nonetheless, there would be clear views of the altered roof profile from the property frontage. The incorporation of the 3 dormer windows would break up the mass of the roof. However, it would fully cover the rear roof slope and so would be seen as an additional storey, including in views from the street. This would dominate the rear elevation of the building and would be at odds with the unbroken roof terraces within the surrounding conservation area. The roof alteration would therefore appear as an incongruous addition to the appeal property resulting in harm to the

character and appearance of the host property and the conservation area, especially in views from the street.

5. I have had regard to the details provided by the appellant of rear dormer windows granted planning permission by the Council within the local area. Based on the information before me these dormer windows do not appear to fully cover the rear roof slopes and the original roof slopes remain legible. Consequently, the roof extensions do not dominate the rear elevation of these properties. Additionally, these roof extensions do not appear as incongruous additions when viewed from the street scene. I find, therefore, that these proposals do not result in the same impact on the host building and surrounding area as the appeal 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 the conservation area. For the reasons given, the proposal would fail to achieve this and would cause less than substantial harm to its significance. No public benefits have been put forward to weigh against this harm.
7. The proposal would therefore be contrary to those aims of policies 55 and 58 of the Cambridge 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.

Conclusion

8. I find that the proposal conflicts with the development plan. No material considerations have been shown to have sufficient weight to warrant a decision otherwise than in accordance with it. Therefore, the appeal does not succeed.

Nichola Robinson

INSPECTOR