



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 September 2022

by David Reed BSc DipTP DMS MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 06 October 2022.

Appeal Ref: APP/V0510/D/22/3298434

83 Downham Road, Ely CB6 3DY

- 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 & Mrs D Misinskas against the decision of East Cambridgeshire District Council.
 - The application Ref 22/00122/FUL, dated 1 February 2022, was refused by notice dated 29 March 2022.
 - The development proposed is two storey side and front extensions, single storey front extension, single storey rear canopy and garage conversion.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the property and the street scene.

Reasons

3. The proposal is for a series of extensions to No 83, one of a line of detached houses on the western side of Downham Road. The house is set well back behind a large front garden/parking area with both No 81 on one side and No 1 Merlin Drive on the other set significantly closer to the road.
4. The Council raise no objection to a first-floor extension above the existing garage which would extend the house towards the flank elevation of No 81.
5. The proposals include a projecting two storey pitched roof extension positioned centrally on the front elevation to form a lobby at ground floor and bathroom extension at first floor. This would be finished with different materials and a shallow gable. The Council consider this would detract from the simple form of the existing property. However, there is a similar two-storey gabled front extension just along the road at No 89 with a non-central example at No 91. Other houses are designed with a front facing gable. In this context, seen in isolation, the central front facing extension would not appear out of place.
6. The Council also object to the single storey front extension projecting alongside the flank elevation of No 81 to accommodate a garage. Whilst forward of the front elevation, this would not appear dominant in the street scene as it would not project beyond the front elevation of No 81. Indeed, it would have the

visual benefit of providing some screening for the large, unattractive flank wall of No 81 with its prominent woodburner flue and soil pipe.

7. However, the overly complex roof form with its combination of three separate gable features on the front of the house – on the garage, side and central extensions – would result in the property having an awkward, disjointed appearance. This would be unduly detrimental to the overall design of the house concerned and thus the street scene as a whole.

Conclusion

8. For this reason the combined effect of the proposed extensions would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the property and the street scene. This would be contrary to Policy ENV2 of the East Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2015 which requires development to be of a high quality, having regard to local context, with the layout, scale, form and massing of buildings relating sympathetically to the surrounding area.
9. Having regard to the above the appeal should be dismissed.

David Reed

INSPECTOR