



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 June 2025

by **D J Barnes MBA BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 30 June 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Q0505/D/25/3360823

13 Cavendish Avenue, Cambridge, Cambridgeshire CB1 7UP

- 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 George and Mrs Ann Dann against the decision of Cambridge City Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/04625/HFUL.
 - The development proposed is erection of a 2 storey rear extension together with a part 2 storey and part single storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. It is considered that the main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and the streetscene.

Reasons

3. The proposed development includes extensions to the side and rear of a detached 2-storey house situated within a predominantly residential area. The streetscene along Cavendish Avenue possesses a spacious and verdant character and appearance associated with the dwellings being set back from the footways to the rear of landscaped front gardens also used for parking, the verges and street trees along the road and the gaps between the dwellings giving views towards the trees within the rear gardens.
4. The property possesses an architectural style of a suburban villa whereas the appeal scheme would be of a contemporary appearance but this difference of styles alone would not be a reason for this appeal to fail, particularly where there are examples of contemporarily designed dwellings fronting Cavendish Avenue. Further, as identified by the appellants and noted during the site visit, other dwellings fronting the road have been altered by the addition of side and roof extensions. Overall, although there is a predominance of 2-storey suburban villas, there is no consistency between the design of these dwellings.
5. At the side of the property an existing single storey garage would be demolished and replaced by the erection of a part 2-storey and part single storey extension. The footprint of the proposed side extension would substantially occupy the gap between the property's original 2-storey flank wall and the side elevation of 15

Cavendish Avenue. The flank wall of the proposed single storey extension would be sited adjacent to the shared boundary with No. 15 which is defined by the side elevation of a garage. Although there would remain a view above the single storey element towards the property's rear garden, harm would be caused to the streetscene's spacious and verdant character and appearance because of the reduction of the physical and visual gaps at ground and first floor levels between the existing property and No. 15.

6. When viewed from the road, there would be a visually awkward juxtaposition between the traditional and contemporary architectural styles of the host property and the proposed side extension. This would arise from the sizes of the proposed vertical openings at first floor level and the 2-storey extension's flat roof which would not match the existing eaves height.
7. For these reasons, the proposed side extension would not successfully contrast with the existing form and architectural detailing of the host property and would not positively contribute to the character and appearance of the streetscene. By reason of this unacceptable harm, there would be a conflict with Policies 55 and 58 of the Cambridge Local Plan (LP) concerning development responding to local characteristics and extensions to buildings successfully contrasting with existing built form, including by reason of respecting the space between buildings, fenestration respecting the host building and roof profiles being sympathetic to the existing building.
8. There would be a glimpsed view from the road of a side elevation of the proposed 2-storey rear extension above the proposed single storey side extension. However, the choice of external materials would not result in this element of the appeal scheme causing harm to the character and appearance of the streetscene.
9. As identified by the council, the ridge height of the proposed rear extension would marginally exceed the overall height of the property's roof and, as such, it would not be fully sympathetic to the existing building. Further the extensive glazing within the proposed extension's rear elevation would not respect the fenestration of the host property. However, these matters alone would not be reasons for this appeal to fail but they add to, albeit in a modest way, to the identified unacceptable harm.
10. Although there is not a specific subservience criterion referenced in LP Policy 58, alterations and extensions should be sympathetic to the existing building. The scale of the appeal scheme would represent a significant addition to the host property, even when allowing for the demolition of the existing garage and a small rear addition. In this context, because of its scale the proposed development would not be a sympathetic extension and would conflict with LP Policy 58(a).
11. For the reasons given, it is concluded that the proposed development would cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the host property and the streetscene and, as such, it would conflict with LP Policies 55 and 58. LP Policy 56 concerns creating successful places rather than extensions to buildings and, as such, it is not of direct relevance to the appeal scheme. Accordingly, it is concluded that this appeal should be dismissed.

D J Barnes

INSPECTOR