

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 January 2017

by L Fleming BSc (Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 20 January 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/W0530/W/16/3159623

9a Bridge Street, Whaddon SG8 5S9

- 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 Mr Edmund Smith against the decision of South Cambridgeshire District Council.
 - The application Ref S/2464/15/FL, dated 21 September 2015, was refused by notice dated 4 August 2016.
 - The development is a 6 metre pole for CCTV security equipment on the above property.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. At the time of my site visit the development had been completed.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the development on the living conditions of people living nearby and using the adjacent footpath with particular regard to privacy.

Reasons

4. No 9a Bridge Street is a dwelling which sits at the end of a narrow side lane off Bridge Street adjacent to a number of detached properties and a public footpath.
 5. The pole is relatively tall and positioned at the entrance to the appeal property at the head of the side lane. Any CCTV equipment mounted on it therefore benefits from relatively wide ranging views down the length of the side lane, the public footpath over adjacent fields and into the private gardens of the dwellings nearby.
 6. Whilst there may be other examples of CCTV nearby, the full details of those examples are not before me. I have considered the appeal on its merits and for the reasons given find the appeal development would allow overlooking of private gardens and public spaces where users would expect to be able to enjoy a degree of privacy.
 7. Thus, the development is harmful to the living conditions of people living nearby and using the adjacent footpath with particular regard to privacy.
-

Furthermore, even if such CCTV equipment was not working, the perception of being overlooked would be equally as harmful as being overlooked.

8. In reaching these conclusions, I have taken into account the security benefits of the development, note that the appeal property has recently been burgled and acknowledge the supplier incorrectly advised that planning permission was not needed for the development. However, these matters do not outweigh the harm I have identified.
9. Thus, for the reasons given the development would not accord with the development plan. It would specifically conflict with Policies DP/2 and DP/3 of the South Cambridgeshire District Council Local Development Framework Development Control Policies Development Plan Document (2007) which taken together aim to ensure good design and that new development does not harm the amenities of users of neighbouring land uses. For the same reasons the development is also in conflict with paragraph 6.67 of the South Cambridgeshire District Council Local Development Framework District Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (2010).

Conclusion

10. For the reasons set out above and with regard to all other matters, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

L Fleming

INSPECTOR