



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 June 2025 by J Kirkaldy BSc (Hons) PGDip MRTPI

Decision by R Aston BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 1 October 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/V0510/D/25/3361372

6 Mulberry Close, Bottisham, Cambridge, CB25 9BW

- 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 Paul and Vishika Carrington against the decision of East Cambridgeshire District Council.
 - The application ref is 24/01195/FUL.
 - The development proposed is an addition of a second storey.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for an addition of a second storey at 6 Mulberry Close, Cambridge, CB25 9BW in accordance with the terms of the application, ref 24/01195/FUL, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans: 6MULCL-BOT1-03, 6MULCL-BOT1-04, 6MULCL_BOT1-05.
 - 3) The external materials to be used in the construction of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing dwelling.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Preliminary Matters

3. Notwithstanding the description of development set out above in the banner heading, which is taken from the application form, it is clear from the description in the officer report, plans and accompanying details that the development also comprises the raising of the roof and construction of a first floor storey. The appeal has been determined on the basis of the same submitted drawings considered by the Council.

Main Issue

4. The main issues are the effect of the proposed development on a) the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area; and b) the living conditions for the occupiers of the neighbouring property at no.48 Ancient Meadows with particular regard to light and privacy.

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. The appeal site comprises of a detached single storey 'L' shaped dwelling situated at the end of a cul de sac.
6. Planning permission was previously granted in 2017 (17/01511/FUL) for the raising of the roof, creation of first floor and extensions at the appeal site. This permission appears to have lapsed and I have not been presented with evidence by either party to indicate otherwise. The application subject to this appeal was for full planning permission but essentially sought to amend the design and appearance of the first floor extension.

Character and appearance

7. On approach into the cul de sac from Beechwood Avenue, the 3 storey side façade of the neighbouring property at no.48 Ancient Meadows dominates the backdrop to the side of the existing front projecting gable of the appeal dwelling. The immediate neighbouring property at no.4 Mulberry Close is a two storey dwelling. The proposal to raise the roof and construct a first floor, creating a two storey dwelling would not therefore appear prominent in this context.
8. Whilst the proposal would substantially increase the size of the dwelling this would be compatible with the immediate surroundings which is characterised by two and three storey detached dwellings. The proposed first floor addition would appear proportionate to the host dwelling. The proposed projecting front gable would be subservient in height to the ridge of the main dwelling and a single storey projection on the side elevation on the boundary with no.4 Mulberry Close would remain, reducing the overall visual bulk of the dwelling.
9. The proposed front elevation includes a full height window at first floor for the stairwell, as well as a full height window for the office and gallery space. The other windows proposed would align with the existing fenestration on the ground floor in terms of their proportion and symmetry. During my site visit I observed a similar fenestration arrangement to that proposed, at no.3 Mulberry Close opposite, and on other dwellings along Beechwood Avenue. These nearby properties feature full height windows on side and front elevations at the first floor, as well as at the ground floor level. Mismatched fenestration is a characteristic of the surrounding area and therefore the fenestration proposed would not be incongruous within the street scene.
10. I therefore conclude that the proposal would not have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area. The proposed development would comply with Policies ENV1 and ENV2 of the East Cambridgeshire Local Plan (2015) and the Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document. These policies and guidance seek amongst other matters to demonstrate that development proposals will through scale, form, design and materials create positive and complementary relationships with existing development.

Living conditions

11. There is a public footpath with mature trees which runs parallel to the side garden boundary of the appeal site, separating and distancing the site with the neighbouring property at no.48 Ancient Meadows. The footpath widens and tapers

along the boundary leading into an area of open space to the rear garden of the neighbouring property. I accept that the proposed extension due to its size and position would result in some reduction of existing light to the garden in the afternoon hours.

12. However, the orientation of no.48, mature trees and set back position of the appeal dwelling, already has an impact on the availability of light into the garden from this direction. However, given that the garden would retain an open aspect beyond the rear boundary and a reasonable separation distance would remain between the appeal dwelling and the neighbouring property, I am not persuaded that any loss of light caused by the proposal would, having regard to the context of the proposed development, result in an unacceptable impact on the occupants of no.48.
13. Given the design and layout of the proposal with obscured glazed windows at first floor on the side elevation facing no.48, the oblique angled views from the Juliet balcony on the rear elevation towards the neighbouring rear garden, the distance of separation and the established boundaries. the proposal would not result in an unacceptable impact on privacy for the occupants of no.48.
14. I therefore conclude that the proposal would not have an unacceptable adverse impact on the living conditions for the occupiers of the neighbouring property at no.48 Ancient Meadows having regard to light and privacy. The proposed development would comply with Policies ENV1 and ENV2 of the East Cambridgeshire Local Plan (2015) and the Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document. These policies and guidance seek amongst other matters to protect the amenities of neighbouring occupiers through high quality design.

Conditions

15. I have imposed the standard conditions relating to the commencement of development and a condition requiring the development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans is necessary as this provides clarity.
16. In the interests of protecting the character and appearance of the dwelling and the surrounding area, a condition requiring the external materials of the extension to match those used in the existing dwelling is imposed.

Conclusion and Recommendation

17. The proposal would accord with the development plan, when read as a whole. Material considerations, including the Framework do not indicate that a decision should be made other than in accordance with the development plan.
18. Having considered all other matters raised, I therefore conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

J Kirkaldy

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

19. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is [allowed or dismissed].

R Aston

INSPECTOR