



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 September 2023

by M Russell BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22nd September 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/Q0505/D/23/3319588

20, Avalon Way, Trumpington, Cambridge CB2 9DX

- 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 J Carter against the decision of Cambridge City Council.
 - The application Ref 22/04307/HFUL, dated 29 September 2022, was refused by notice dated 2 February 2023.
 - The development proposed is first and second storey extension.
-

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 area.

Reasons

3. The appeal dwelling is located at the edge of a modern estate and faces towards Trumpington Meadows public open space and its network of public footpaths. It sits at the end of a row of four dwellings of a similar design and materials. Three of the dwellings in this group include side projections which incorporate pitched roofs, a subservient ridge line and front dormer windows. These dormers replicate the design and proportions of dormers on the main roofs of these dwellings and others seen throughout the estate.
4. Even though there are a variety of dwelling types and designs within the estate, some of which include balconies, there is general regularity amongst the design of individual groups of dwellings. The shared characteristics of the group of dwellings that the host dwelling sits within and the repeated architectural features within the estate give order and consistency to the street scene and make for a high-quality residential environment.
5. The extensions would consume the pitched roof of the host dwelling's side projection, introducing flat roofed elements and an alternative window arrangement. Moreover, at second-floor level, the windows and roof terrace would span the full width of the extension's front elevation. These elements of the proposal would appear incongruous and would unacceptably contrast with the more unified design of other dwellings in the row. The use of matching materials would not be sufficient to effectively assimilate the proposal into its surroundings.
6. The harm to the cohesiveness and architectural rhythm of the street scene would be compounded due to the prominent location of the dwelling at the

periphery of the estate where it would be readily appreciated from within the adjacent public open space.

7. I conclude, the proposal would significantly detract from the character and appearance of the area. In that regard, it would conflict with the design, character and context requirements of Policies 55 (Responding to context), 56 (Creating successful places), 58 (Altering and extending existing buildings) of the Cambridge Local Plan (2018) LP. For the same reasons the proposal would also conflict with Appendix E (Roof Extensions Design Guide) of the LP and the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) which includes that proposals should be of a good design, add to the overall quality of the area, be visually attractive as a result of good architecture and be sympathetic to local character including the surrounding built environment.

Other Matters

8. My attention has been drawn to a letter to the appellant from Barratt Homes. However, as indicated in the letter any consent given by them does not override other requirements including the need for planning permission. For the reasons set out under the main issue the proposal would be unacceptable having regard to the policies of the development plan and the Framework.
9. Whether or not the proposal would have a benefit for the economy through its construction, increase the value of the host property, meet a growing need for executive housing, improve the functionality of the living space for occupiers of the dwelling and be acceptable in Green Belt terms, these are not matters which overcome the harm identified under the main issue. In that respect the harm that would result to the character and appearance of the area is of overriding concern and conflicts with the environmental objectives of the Framework.

Conclusion

10. The proposal would have a significantly harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area and conflicts with the development plan taken as a whole. There are no material considerations that indicate the decision should be made other than in accordance with the development plan. The appeal is therefore dismissed.

M Russell

INSPECTOR