
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 October 2017

by Chris Forrett BSc(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 15th November 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/W0530/D/17/3179317

34 South Road, Great Abington, Cambridge, Cambridgeshire CB21 6AU

- 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 Zielinski against the decision of South Cambridgeshire District Council.
 - The application Ref S/0257/17/FL, dated 25 January 2017, was refused by notice dated 13 April 2017.
 - The development proposed is an annexe.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal site is located on the north side of South Road and largely consists of an existing workshop/garage and a hard-surfaced area. The site is located outside of the Great Abington village development framework and therefore, in planning policy terms, is located in the countryside. The area itself is rural in character, with the properties along South Road being set in large plots with a mixture of rural/agricultural based activities interspersed between dwellings.
4. Policy HG/6 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Development Framework Development Control Policies Development Plan Document (2007) (DCPDPD) states that extensions to dwelling in the countryside will only be permitted where the proposed development would not create a separate dwelling or be capable of separation from the existing dwelling.
5. The proposed annex would be located away from the existing dwelling and would contain two bedrooms, a bathroom, a utility room and a large living room together with an integral garage. Whilst full kitchen facilities are not shown on the plan, there is ample space for such provision. Given the siting away from the existing dwelling, together with the facilities of the proposed annex, it would be functionally be separate from the main dwelling.
6. From the appeal information it is unclear who would occupy the annex with conflicting information being provided. The statement indicates that the Appellant would occupy the annex (as they have a need to downsize from the

main dwelling and be in close proximity to the main dwelling to allow their son to look after them and take over the business). However, it goes on to state that the annex would be for the Appellants dependant son.

7. Furthermore, the Appellants statement also states that whilst the existing dwelling is fully equipped with a single kitchen and bathroom it does not allow for the two families to live independent lives. To my mind, this adds weight to my view that the annex would be occupied independently of the main dwelling.
8. Turning to the design and scale of the proposed building, this would be larger than the existing workshop/garage and would be sited in a prominent position being highly visible from South Road. It would also feature a dormer window which would give the building a domestic appearance.
9. Whilst the annex would be smaller than the main dwelling it would be around 7.5 metres in height. This would be significantly larger than the other stable buildings which would remain. Whilst I consider that the footprint of the building is not excessive, its overall height means that it would have a significant effect on the generally open and rural character of the area.
10. My attention has been drawn to a number of other annex proposals in Great Abington, including ones on South Road. However, very limited details of these have been provided to me and I am unable to judge whether these are comparable to the appeal development especially in relation to their siting to the host dwelling and the size of the annex accommodation itself. Moreover, each application must be considered on its individual merits.
11. For the above reasons the proposed annex would harm the rural character and appearance of the area and would be contrary to Policies HG/6, DP/2 and DP/7 of the DCPDPD which amongst other matters seek to ensure that new development preserves or enhances the character of the local area and that proposals (such as annexes) do not create a separate dwelling or be capable of separation from the existing dwelling.

Conclusion

12. Taking all matters into consideration, including support for the proposal from the Parish Council, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Chris Forrett

INSPECTOR