



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 June 2025 by J Kirkaldy

Decision by Martin Seaton BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10 October 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/W0530/D/25/3364877

10 Ambrose Way, Impington, Cambridge, CB24 9US

- 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 A Kerins against the decision of South Cambridgeshire District Council.
 - The application ref is 25/00195/HFUL.
 - The development proposed is a first floor side extension, installation of new windows and rooflights.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a first floor side extension, installation of new windows and rooflights at 10 Ambrose Way, Cambridge, CB24 9US in accordance with the terms of the application, ref 25/00195/HFUL, and the plans submitted with it, 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 no's: 24PL100, 24PL102, 24PL103, Location Plan.
 - 3) The first floor window serving the ensuite bathroom shown on the rear elevation of Drawing No. 24PL103, shall be glazed with obscure glass to a level equivalent to Level 3 or above (or nearest equivalent standard) and shall have a restrictive opening system allowing a maximum opening of 10cm. The window shall be retained in that form thereafter.

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.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are the effect of the proposed development on the living conditions of the occupiers of the neighbouring properties at No.4 Ambrose Way, with particular regard to outlook, and No.4 Mill Lane, with particular regard to privacy.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal site is occupied by a two storey detached dwelling situated within a small cul de sac in a residential area. The proposed development would not lead to an increase in the footprint of the dwelling. It would, however, see an increase in

the height of the existing single storey projection on the rear elevation of the appeal dwelling. The proposed first floor extension would add to the overall mass and scale of the dwelling although it would be subordinate to the ridge height of the main dwelling.

No. 4 Ambrose Way.

5. The proposal would be set in from the shared boundary with no.4 Ambrose Way and would maintain a distance of separation of in excess of 1.5m, which would assist in minimising any potential for impact on outlook within the rear garden for the occupants of no.4 Ambrose Way.
6. The existing side elevation of the appeal dwelling extends along part of the shared rear garden boundary with no.4 Ambrose Way. Whilst I accept that the proposal would further extend this side elevation at a two-storey height, it would not result in a complete enclosure for the entire width of the rear garden boundary. I accept that there would be some resultant loss of outlook with the development extending above the boundary fence when viewed from the rear garden patio of no.4 Ambrose Way. However, the existing garden is of a sufficient width that despite its enclosure by single storey garages on both sides, it would still maintain open aspects above and between the garages and from part of the rear garden for the appeal dwelling.
7. For these reasons, the proposed development would not result in a sense of enclosure or impact on outlook which would be sufficient to result in an unacceptable impact on the living conditions of the neighbouring occupants of no.4 Ambrose Way. I am also mindful of the relatively high-density nature of the cul de sac and the existing relationship between the dwellings. The resulting relationship between the extension and surrounding buildings would not therefore be particularly unusual.

No.4 Mill Lane.

8. The Council have raised concern that the proposed first floor extension would bring the first-floor windows facing no.4 Mill Lane closer to the boundary with the neighbouring property. In this regard, I note that the existing distance between the rear elevation of the appeal dwelling and no.4 Mill Lane falls marginally below the minimum distance recommended in the South Cambridgeshire District Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (2010).
9. The SPD states that for rear two storey residential properties a minimum distance of 25m should be provided between rear or side building facing elevations containing habitable rooms. However, the National Design Guide (2021) sets no distance requirement, instead seeking to ensure suitable privacy for future occupants. There is also no minimum distance requirement in the policies of the Development Plan. The current distance of separation is 24m, whilst the proposal would further reduce the distance by 3m at first floor level, a distance of 21m would still represent a significant separation between habitable room windows. Such a separation distance would not be unusual in residential areas between the upper floors of other dwellings from living rooms or bedrooms.
10. I observed during the site visit that mutual overlooking already exists with the appeal site possessing direct views into the existing first floor windows of no.4 Mill Lane. However, the inter-visibility is reduced as two of the windows appeared to be

single pane and obscured glazed. I am satisfied that a similar approach could be taken and secured by a condition requiring the first floor ensuite window of the proposal to be obscurely glazed in the interests of protecting privacy for the occupants of the appeal site and occupants of the neighbouring property. With this mitigation, I would be content that an adequate distance of separation would be maintained and therefore the proposal would not result in a harmful level of additional overlooking into the habitable rooms of no.4 Mill Lane.

11. I therefore conclude that the proposal would not have a harmful effect on the living conditions for the occupants of no.4 Mill Lane and no.4 Ambrose Way. Although there would be some limited conflict with the SPD, the proposed development would comply with Policy S7 and HQ.1 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan (2018) which seeks to provide development that is of an appropriate scale and density for its location and seeks to protect the health and amenity of occupiers and surrounding uses from development that is overlooking, overbearing.

Conditions

12. 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 for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.
13. In light of the concerns regarding the relationship with the neighbouring property at no.4 Mill Lane, a condition relating to the use of obscure glazing to the ensuite window is necessary for privacy.

Conclusion and Recommendation

14. For the reasons given above the appeal should be allowed.

J Kirkaldy

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

15. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is allowed.

Martin Seaton

INSPECTOR