



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 February 2004

by **Terence N Povey** BA BArch MA FRTPI RIBA MCI

an Inspector appointed by the First Secretary of State

564
The Planning Inspectorate
4/09 Kite Wing
Temple Quay House
2 The Square
Temple Quay
Bristol BS1 6PN
☎ 0117 372 6372
e-mail:
enquiries@planning-
inspectorate.gsi.gov.uk
Date

19 MAR 2004

Appeal Ref: APP/Q0505/A/03/1132780

Site address: 274 Coldhams Lane, Cambridge CB1 3HN

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
- The appeal is made by Ms G. Teo against the decision of Cambridge City Council.
- The application ref: C/03/0749/FP, dated 9 July 2003, was refused by notice dated 11 September 2003.
- The development proposed is a two story side extension to form two flats..

Decision

1. For the reasons given below I dismiss the appeal.

Reasons for the decision

2. No 274 Coldhams Lane is a semi-detached house which stands on the corner of Coldhams Lane and Vinery Way. The property is a three bedroom dwelling of modest size and unassuming appearance. The house is situated in a residential area which to my mind is characterized by semi-detached and terraced houses of similarly modest size set alongside wide roads; this gives the locality a pleasantly spacious character and a reasonably homogeneous appearance.
3. The proposal involves the erection of an addition to the side and rear of No 274. It would be two storeys high and significantly greater in size and bulk than the existing property; it would extend to within a short distance of the side boundary and extend over three metres back from the rear of the house. In my opinion this large and bulky extension would be out of keeping with the small-scale nature of the existing house and its neighbours. I also consider that its extensive and poorly proportioned expanse of flank wall would result in it appearing as a dominating and unprepossessing feature on this prominent corner site. I have therefore concluded that the addition would serve to detract from the otherwise pleasant character and appearance of the locality and to undermine its spacious character.
4. Turning to the proposed layout of the site, I note that the scheme incorporates parking spaces for three cars on the site, together with storage space for bicycles. Sites for dustbins are also proposed, although these seem to me to be poorly located in that they would be set close to living room and bedroom windows. While I acknowledge that the Appellant has pointed out that the dustbin provision could be redesigned, it is nevertheless clear to me that the large extension would leave very little room on this small site to accommodate both servicing provision and amenity space for occupiers of the three dwellings. In this context I am not convinced that the proposed layout

demonstrates that a satisfactory arrangement of amenity space and outlook, reasonably free from noise and air pollution, would be provided for residents.

5. These considerations lead me to conclude that the proposal conflicts with the provisions of policy SP12/10 of the Cambridgeshire Structure plan 1995 and policies BE1, BE2 and BE4 of the Cambridge local Plan 1996 with respect to its harmful effect of the character and appearance of the area. With regard to the unsatisfactory standard of layout and amenity I consider that the proposal would conflict with the provisions of structure plan policy SP12/10 and local plan policy E01, as well as with the aims of the Council's adopted supplementary guidance on housing development.

Terence Pavey

INSPECTOR