



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 August 2024

by P Eggleton BSc(Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 2 September 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/Q0505/W/24/3339640

2 The Grove, Cambridge, Cambridgeshire CB4 1TJ

- 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 Jon Wilks against the decision of Cambridge City Council.
 - The application reference is 23/03193/FUL.
 - The development proposed is a dwelling formed as an extension to the existing dwelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect on the character and appearance of the area; and the adequacy of the accommodation with regard to size, outlook and privacy.

Reasons

3. The proposal would extend the existing dwelling towards the shared boundary with 3 The Grove and would provide a separate two-bedroom house. The houses within The Grove, particularly those that are closest to Cam Causeway, have a spacious setting which is enhanced by the angle of their footprint and the distances from the frontages of the properties towards the head of The Grove.
 4. The angle of the extended property, in relation to 3 The Grove, would help to retain separation between the two frontages. However, the proposed forward projection and the two-storey side element, would result in the new development dominating the appearance of the neighbouring dwelling. The proposed relationship would result in a cramped arrangement that would unacceptably reduce the spaciousness of the setting of 3 The Grove. The uncharacteristic forward projection and the convoluted form of the roof would increase the prominence of these works. Overall, the additions would detract from the character and appearance of the area and would be contrary to policies 52(a), 55(a&c), 56(a&c) and 58(b,e&f) of the Cambridge Local Plan 2018 (LP).
-

5. Whilst the council has raised concerns regarding the size of the accommodation, it would fall only slightly short of the requirements of the Government's Technical Housing Standards – nationally described space standard (2015), which are required by LP policy 50. The proposal would satisfy the external residential space standards. As the internal layout would make good use of the space, the shortfall would not result in significant detriment to the living conditions of future residents. There would not therefore be conflict with the objectives of LP policy 50.
6. The rear bedroom would have an outlook that would almost entirely be towards the side elevation of 3 The Grove. Given the limited distance between the window and the neighbouring property, this arrangement would represent poor design. As 3 The Grove appears to have a similar internal layout to the appeal property and given the angles, there would be some, but only very limited potential for intervisibility between the stairs and landing of that property and the proposed bedroom window. This limited potential does not add to my concerns but having the bathroom and stair windows within the limited outlook from the proposed bedroom window, adds to my concern with regard to the unacceptable outlook and the proposed design. The arrangement would result in unacceptably poor living conditions for future residents with regard to outlook from that bedroom and would represent poor design. There would therefore be conflict with LP policy 52(c) and 58(e) and the amenity requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework 2023.
7. The proposal would result in the addition of a new dwelling with appropriate amenity space, parking and storage, in an area where additional properties and increases in density could be supported, in accordance with LP policy 3. It would therefore result in significant social and economic benefits and gain some support from LP policy 52(b&d). A small dwelling has already been added to the side of the attached property without detriment to the wider area. However, that dwelling does not offer significant weight in favour of this design as it is contained within a subservient addition to the side of the property and does not significantly alter the setting of these houses.
8. In conclusion, whilst the principle of a new dwelling, in this sustainable location, gains considerable support, this proposal, given its relationship with the neighbouring property, would be too large and dominant for the plot. In these circumstances, the harm that would result to the character and appearance of the area would outweigh the benefits of the proposal. The amenity shortcomings add to my concerns. I therefore dismiss the appeal.

Peter Eggleton

INSPECTOR