



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 August 2025

by **K E Down MA(Oxon) MSc MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 28 August 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/V0510/D/25/3369043

30 Little Green, Cheveley, Newmarket, CB8 9RG

- 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 and Mrs K Jones against the decision of East Cambridgeshire District Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/00240/FUL.
 - The development proposed is a two storey rear extension and porch.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. There are two main issues. Firstly, the effect of the proposed two storey rear extension on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area, including the street scene of Little Green; and secondly, the effect of the two storey rear extension on the living conditions of occupiers of the adjoining dwelling with respect to light.

Reasons

3. The appeal dwelling is a traditional semi-detached house. It is rendered and painted and has a hipped, tiled roof. It and its attached neighbour both have single storey rear extensions. The pair is one of three similar pairs set on Little Green, a relatively quiet street near the edge of Cheveley. The appeal dwelling is set on a very large plot but has a narrow boundary with the street. The plot widens towards the rear of the dwelling before the northern boundary changes direction beyond the dwelling and the plot narrows slightly towards the far end.
4. The Council does not object to the proposed single storey front porch and since it would be a modest addition that would be of an appropriate scale, I find it would be acceptable. Neither is there any objection to the replacement of the single storey rear extension on a similar footprint. I shall therefore restrict my further consideration to the proposed two storey rear extension.
5. The proposed extension would be entirely to the rear of the dwelling but almost half its width would project beyond the original side elevation, meaning both the front and side of the extension would be clearly visible from the street. From immediately in front of the dwelling the significant setback and relatively modest side projection would mean the extension did not appear as a disproportionate or overly dominant

feature. Nevertheless, the proposed roof would appear dissociated from the host dwelling, giving an incongruous and disjointed appearance with poor integration between the dwelling and the extension.

6. The side elevation, which would be clearly visible from Little Green across the open frontage of the commercial premises to the south, would be a stark and dominant feature. It would be deeper than the original two storey dwelling at some 7m. This, coupled with the proposed roof that would appear separate from the roof of the existing dwelling and would be of noticeably different appearance, would make the extension stand out as a large and inharmonious addition. The relationship between the host dwelling and the extension, exacerbated by the differing materials, would make it appear almost as a separate building, bolted on to the host building, creating an awkward juxtaposition between the two.
7. The use of contemporary materials in the external surfaces of the walls and roof would not, in itself, be objectionable. However, in this case, where the integration between the proposed extension and the host dwelling is poor, it would only serve to emphasise the disjointed character of the development as a whole.
8. The appellants suggest that because the proposed roof would be lower the extension would remain subordinate to the host dwelling. However, with its extensive footprint and depth, I cannot agree with this view. It is also suggested that the criticism of the proposed design is subjective and not justified. On the contrary, as reasoned, it is predominantly the noticeable lack of sensitive integration with the host building, together with the excessive depth of the extension that would amount to poor design. Moreover, whilst not demanding uniformity, the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) clearly expects good design that is visually attractive and sympathetic to local character.
9. It is concluded on the first main issue that, owing to its scale, design and poor integration with the original dwelling, the proposed two storey rear extension would have a materially detrimental effect on the host dwelling and the surrounding area, including the street scene of Little Green. In consequence, it would conflict with the requirements of Policies ENV1 and ENV2 of the East Cambridgeshire Local Plan April 2015 (LP) (as Amended 2023) and Policy CHEV 7 of the Cheveley Neighbourhood Plan, 2023, insofar as they expect new development to be of a high quality, informed by, in keeping with and sympathetic to local character, such that its location, scale, form, design and materials will create positive, complementary relationships with existing development, including the host building, and the surrounding area.
10. Turning to the effect on living conditions, the appeal dwelling lies to the south of its attached neighbour and the proposed two storey rear extension would come within about 2.3m of the shared boundary. The attached neighbour has a glazed conservatory extension to the rear with garden beyond. The proposed extension would extend further to the rear than the conservatory. Whilst material loss of daylight to the neighbouring property appears unlikely, owing to the orientation of the buildings, coupled with the height and depth of the proposed extension and its proximity to the shared boundary, it is likely that material overshadowing and loss of sunlight would occur.
11. The appellants suggest that a daylight/sunlight survey would likely show that any overshadowing was minimal. However, no such survey has been submitted in

evidence. In its absence, I have used the available evidence and taken a precautionary approach in reaching my conclusion.

12. It is concluded on the second main issue that the proposed development would be likely to have a materially harmful effect on the living conditions of occupiers of the adjoining property with respect to overshadowing and loss of sunlight. In consequence, it would conflict with LP Policy ENV2 which expects new development to ensure there is no significantly detrimental effect on the residential amenity of nearby occupiers.
13. For the reasons set out above and having regard to all other matters raised, including the lack of response from the Council to communications from the appellant's agent, which although regrettable do not alter or outweigh the identified harm, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

KE Down
INSPECTOR