
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 April 2025

by **K Williams MTCP (Hons) MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 09 May 2025.

Appeal Ref: APP/V0510/D/24/3358094

108 Centre Drive, Newmarket CB8 8AP

- 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 Ms Bennett against the decision of East Cambridgeshire District Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/00842/FUL.
 - The development proposed is to construct a two-storey and single-storey rear extension, to include dormer windows as well as the reconfiguration of ground and first floor.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are:
 - the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area and the host property; and
 - the effect of the proposal on the living conditions of the occupiers of 106 Centre drive with particular regard to outlook.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The appeal property comprises a one and a half storey home, it has a large garden to one side and to the rear, with numerous trees. The property has a distinctive front gable, and partial hipped roof. The adjacent property at 106 Centre Drive, is of a similar appearance, scale and form. Centre Drive is predominantly residential. Overall, there is a variety of building types, but most homes are of a modest scale and mass. This consistent characteristic creates a sense of space between buildings and positively contributes to the character and appearance of the area.
4. The proposal would extend the property from the original rear elevation, with two steeply pitched gables and a side hipped roof dormer window. The apex of the two-storey extensions would be high, but nevertheless they would be set below the main ridge of the host property. Therefore, the front gable feature, partial hipped roof feature and side plane of the opposing roof would remain unaltered.
5. The two-storey element facing the large side garden is relatively modest and just in proportion to the host property, albeit the large side dormer adds bulk to this. However, the accompanying two-storey rear extension that runs alongside the

boundary with No 106 would nearly match the existing length of the host property. The width of the extension would also be substantial and almost as wide as the host property. The varying two-storey elements would be linked together with a slightly incongruous flat roof single-storey extension which ultimately overload and erode the legibility of the diminutive host property and thus would be harmful to it.

6. There would be some screening from trees and surrounding development. However, the two-storey rear extensions would be very visible within the street scene due to the surrounding lower properties and open aspect afforded by the side garden of the host dwelling. There would be an erosion of space around buildings, and due to effect on the host building there would be combined harm to the character and appearance of the area.
7. I therefore conclude the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the area and the host property. The proposal would therefore conflict with Policies ENV1 and ENV2 of the East Cambridgeshire Local Plan April 2015 (as amended 2023) (the Local Plan). Together and insofar as they are relevant to this matter, these seek to ensure development is of a high quality design, which will create positive complementary relationships with existing development.

Living conditions

8. The proposal is high and would be very prominent for the neighbouring occupier at No 106. However, there would be a sloping roof plane, as opposed to a high brick wall next to the joint boundary. There is also relatively generous spacing between the side of the existing appeal dwelling and joint boundary to No 106. No 106 also has similar generous spacing, and a long garden, and I observed structures within the grounds. The land immediately adjacent to the boundary did not appear to be used for sitting out. Even if the above is not the case, and whilst the proposal would be highly visible within the garden of No 106, the length of the garden, the ample spacing around the development and the existing structures would alleviate the effect of the resultant large mass.
9. I conclude that the proposal would not have a harmful effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of No 106 Centre Drive. The proposal would be in accordance with Policy ENV2 of the Local Plan, which seeks to ensure that development is not significantly detrimental to the residential amenity of nearby occupiers.

Other Matters

10. The Council has referred to an approved development at the appeal site, reference 23/01194/FUL. However, I have not been provided with these details, and therefore cannot make a comparison between these and the proposal before me. That there have been no objections to the proposal, that the site is not in a conservation area or near heritage assets also does not obviate the need for high quality design.
11. I have been made aware that many nearby homes have been extended. The Appellant contends properties at 100, 106, 110, 127 and 129 Centre Drive have been granted planning permission for extensions. However, not all of these properties are the same type as the appeal property, nor do they appear sufficiently similar overall in terms of the proposals before me. In any event, I have not been provided with the full details and they may have been determined under a

different set of circumstances, planning policies and other evidence which is not before me in this appeal. As such they do not carry sufficient weight to alter my decision, which I have assessed on its own merits.

Conclusion

12. The proposal conflicts with the development plan and the material considerations do not indicate that the appeal should be decided other than in accordance with it. For the reasons given above, I conclude the appeal should be dismissed.

K Williams

INSPECTOR