



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 April 2025

by **S. Hartley BA (Hons) Dist.TP (Manc) DMS MRTPI MRICS**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 07 April 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Q0505/D/25/3359575
291, Arbury Road, Cambridge CB4 2JL

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Page and Miss Brown against the decision of Cambridge City Council .
 - The application Ref is 24/03884/HFUL
 - The development proposed is for the demolition of an existing conservatory, the construction of a new two storey side extension and a single storey rear extension, and the installation of new roof lights.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The National Planning Policy Framework was revised in December 2024 and amended on 7 February 2025 to correct cross references from footnotes 7 and 8, and to amend the end of the first sentence of paragraph 155 to make its intent clear. The 2025 Framework (the Framework) has not materially changed in terms of the identified main issues below and therefore, it has not been necessary for me to seek comments from the main parties.

The Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed two-storey side extension upon the character and appearance of the dwelling and the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is in a residential area and is a two-storey, brick-built dwelling with a double pitched roof, located on the corner of Arbury Road and St Albans Road. It has a front amenity space with its gable elevation facing Arbury Road. It has a side amenity area facing St. Albans Road, with boundary fencing to its footpath.
5. The proposal is to erect a single storey extension along the entire length of the rear elevation and to include a balcony, plus a two-storey side extension on the side land adjoining St Albans Road.
6. The local planning authority raises no objection to the proposed single storey rear extension or to the proposed balcony, subject to a condition to prevent overlooking from the latter. I have no reason to disagree.

7. Therefore, the matter in contention is the proposed two-storey side extension.
8. The siting of the existing host property has been generally aligned with the building line of other dwellings along this part of St Albans Road. This provides an uncramped and spacious appearance to the junction of St Albans Road with Arbury Road, which adds positively and distinctively to the character and appearance of both the host property and that of the area.
9. The proposed side extension would extend in front of the general building line along St Albans Way, and would significantly and adversely affect the spacious character and appearance of the existing dwelling and the area as I have described it.
10. The appellant has referred to another side extension to a property at the junction of Arbury Road and Mere Way, but here the extension does not abut the side boundary in the same way as the appeal proposal. For the above reason, I do not consider that the example quoted is directly analogous. Moreover, I have determined the appeal upon its individual merits and based upon its immediate context.
11. I acknowledge that the proposed side extension, by being set down from the existing ridge of the host property and by being set in from its front elevation, would be subservient to it. However, this does not outweigh the harm to the open and spacious character which I have identified.
12. In addition, the proposed windows to the front elevation of the extension, especially the small window at first floor level, by its overall size and shape has an incongruous appearance in relation to the windows in the host property. However, had I been minded to allow the appeal, this is a matter which I consider could have been resolved by way of a condition.
13. Overall, I conclude that the proposed development would not accord with policies 55, 56 and 58 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2018) which require that development, including alterations and extensions, shall be sympathetic to the character of their surrounding areas and their related buildings. For the same reason, it would not accord with chapter 12 of the Framework.

Conclusion

14. I conclude that there are no material planning considerations that indicate that the application should be determined other than in accordance with the development plan for the area and national planning policy. Therefore, for the above reasons, I conclude that, when the development is considered as a whole, the appeal should be dismissed.

S. Hartley

INSPECTOR