The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 July 2017

by Graham Wyatt BA (Hons) MRTPI

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

Decision date: 2 August 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/Q0505/W/17/3172536
131 Queen Ediths Way, Cambridge CB1 8PL

- 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 M Sadeghian against the decision of Cambridge City Council.
- The application Ref 16/1936/FUL, dated 25 October 2016, was refused by notice dated 3 January 2017.
- The development proposed is a 1 storey house to the rear of 131 Queen Ediths Way, Cambridge.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. The site has been the subject of previous appeals[1] against a decision for a '2 storey house' and a'1 ½ storey house' to the rear of 131 Queen Ediths Way, Cambridge CB1 8PL. The appeals concerned a similar proposal to that the subject of this appeal. I have considered the previous Inspector's findings and decisions on the proposal's effect on the character and appearance of the area. The evidence before me indicates that the significant difference between the previous appeal proposals and the one before me is the revised layout, scale and appearance of the proposed dwelling. For that reason, it is for me to consider whether these material changes would lead me to arrive at a different conclusion to that made by the previous Inspector.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. 131 Queen Ediths Way lies on the corner of Strangeways Road. As a result, the garden to 131 extends along and faces onto Strangeways Road. The appeal site forms the end of the rear garden whereby a single storey dwelling would be sited. The area is residential in character with a variety of styles and size of dwellings apparent. Despite the differing architectural types, the area is formed by predominantly two storey dwellings. There is a degree of uniformity to the area which has a pleasant suburban quality, defined by the spaces about

[1] APP/Q0505/W/15/3140562 and 3140567 dated 13 June 2016

and between dwellings and is reinforced by the presence of mature landscaping.

5. The rear garden of the appeal site is long and narrow with the proposed dwelling to be sited towards the end. To the north of the proposed dwelling would be a parking space, bin and cycle store and to the south a private garden area. The building has been designed to represent two double garages with pyramidal roofs and a flat roof element linking the two buildings. The principle elevation would face onto Strangeways Road. The rear elevation would be sited to abut the rear boundary of the site.

6. The proposed dwelling would have a reduced scale in comparison to the previous schemes that were dismissed at appeal. Nevertheless, as a result of its scale at some 10 m in length, 4 m wide and 3.6 m in height, along with the limited depth of the front garden, the proposed dwelling would appear as a cramped from of development which would be dominant in the street scene and out of keeping with the prevailing character of the area. This would result in material harm to the character and appearance of the area.

7. I acknowledge that the appellant has attempted to overcome the previous Inspectors concerns by reducing the overall scale of the building and introducing additional landscaping to shield the development from public view. However, the building would be visible while the hedge becomes established and cannot be relied upon to become permanent. Moreover, I do not consider the harm to the street scene would be mitigated by the proposed or existing hedging at the site. In addition, although designed to look like garages, the development would still be perceived as a dwelling as a result of the garden areas and pedestrian access to the building along with the bin and cycle stores to be used in association with its residential occupancy. Furthermore, it is a somewhat contrived and awkward design response, which further contributes to the harm I have identified above.

8. I conclude that the development would have an unacceptably harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies 3/4, 3/7, 3/10 and 3/12 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 which seek, amongst other things, to ensure that development proposals do not detract from the prevailing character and appearance of the area, respond well to their context and have a positive impact on their setting.

Conclusion

9. Therefore, having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Graham Wyatt

INSPECTOR