



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/25/3364380

28 Russell Court, Cambridge, Cambridgeshire CB2 1HW

- 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 Mrs Noemie Borel against the decision of Cambridge City Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/00335/HFUL.
 - The development proposed is the addition of an extra storey.
-

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 surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a 2-storey end of terrace dwelling which forms part of a development of similarly designed 2 and 3-storey residential buildings occupied as houses and flats.
4. The terrace within which the property is situated possesses a symmetrical appearance with the penultimate dwellings being 3-storeys high and the remainder 2-storeys in height. The front elevations of the first and second storeys of the 3-storey dwellings are set back from their ground floor front elevations. At the rear, the walls of the 3-storey dwellings project further rearwards than the neighbouring 2-storey dwellings, including the rear elevation of the appeal property. Irrespective of their height, the dwellings possess symmetrical gable roof forms of a similar pitch.
5. The proposed development includes the erection of an extension to create a second floor which would have a front elevation set back from the front wall of the property. The rear elevation of the proposed extension would be sited above the existing rear wall rather than respect the siting of the rear elevations of the other 3-storey dwellings within the terrace. The difference in the siting of the existing and proposed elevations would result in the property possessing an asymmetric roof form rather than replicating the symmetrical gable roof form of other dwellings within the terrace. Although the height of the resulting property would not be at odds with other 3-storey buildings, the appeal scheme would disrupt the symmetry

of the terrace and fail to adequately reflect the design and form of the other 3-storey dwellings which form part of the terrace.

6. For these reasons, the proposed development would not be sympathetic to the existing property and the surrounding area and this unacceptable harm would be visible from the accessway at the front of the terrace, Russell Court at the rear and the amenity area within the adjoining residential development. There would be a conflict with Policies 55 and 58 of the Cambridge Local Plan (LP) which refer to using local characteristics to help inform design matters, including massing and form, and for extensions being sympathetic to the existing building and surrounding area.
7. The council has not identified that the proposed development would cause harm to the character, appearance and heritage significance of the New Town and Glisson Road Conservation Area and there are no reasons to disagree with the council's assessment. However, this does not alter the judgement reached about the identified unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area. Accordingly, it is concluded that the proposed development would cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area and, as such, it would conflict with LP Policies 55 and 58.

Other Matters

8. Reference has been made by the appellant to a family need for the proposed accommodation, a desire to avoid a rear extension being erected as permitted development and wanting to adopt a less carbon intensive means of extending the host property. However, these matters are collectively given only moderate weight in the determination of this appeal and, as such, they are demonstrably outweighed by the unacceptable harm which has been identified. Accordingly, it is concluded that this appeal should be dismissed.

D J Barnes

INSPECTOR