
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 April 2024

by David Reed BSc DipTP DMS MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 08.05.2024

Appeal Ref: APP/V0510/D/23/3334875

22 Lisle Lane, Ely, Cambridgeshire CB7 4AS

- 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 R Crome against the decision of East Cambridgeshire District Council.
 - The application Ref 23/01097/FUL, dated 4 October 2023, was refused by notice dated 30 November 2023.
 - The development proposed is the removal of car port and construction of two storey side 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 host property and the street scene, including the effect on the Ely Conservation Area (CA).

Reasons

3. The proposal is for a two-storey side extension to No 22, a semi-detached house on the eastern side of Lisle Lane following the removal of an existing car port. The extension, just under 3.5 m wide, would completely fill the gap to the common boundary with the neighbouring property No 24, a two-storey detached house, leaving a pedestrian passageway alongside that house as the only gap between the two buildings.
4. The side extension would only be marginally set back from the adjacent front wall of No 22 and the ridgeline of the pitched roof would line up with and only be marginally lower than the ridge of the existing roof¹. As a result, contrary to the views of the appellant, the extension would not appear subservient to the original house and would significantly unbalance the visual symmetry of the semi-detached pair Nos 22/20. The original building would not appear clearly legible and predominant, contrary to the Council's 2012 design guide.
5. In addition, with the narrow gap between the extended No 22 and No 24 only apparent for a short distance when passing immediately in front, the proposal would result in an undesirable 'terracing effect' when seen on the approach from either direction. Whilst the extension would be set back slightly from

¹ No dimensions are provided in either case.

No 24 on one side and the front facing gable feature of Nos 22/20 on the other, this would not significantly break up the overall terraced appearance that would be created. Whilst there are some rows of simply designed terraced properties in the vicinity, the proposal would result in a visually jarring, asymmetrical building that would appear out of place amongst its neighbours.

6. For these reasons the proposal would significantly harm the character and appearance of the host property and the street scene, and would not preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Ely CA. This would conflict with Policies ENV2 and ENV11 of the East Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2015 which requires development to be high quality, complementing local distinctiveness, having regard for local context, and, within a CA, to be of a particularly high standard in order to preserve or enhance its character or appearance.

Conclusion

7. The proposal would provide improved accommodation for a young family, has been amended from an earlier scheme in an attempt to overcome objections, and attracted no adverse comment from the City of Ely Council or neighbours. However, these points do not outweigh the harm that would result to the character and appearance of the property and street scene and the associated conflict with the development plan and the aims of CA designation.
8. Having regard to the above the appeal should be dismissed.

David Reed

INSPECTOR