



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 March 2020

by C Beeby BA (Hons) MIPROW

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26th March 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/W0530/W/20/3245237
68 Rampton Drift, Longstanton CB24 3EW

- 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 Tim Preston against the decision of South Cambridgeshire District Council.
 - The application Ref S/2121/19/FL, dated 18 June 2019, was refused by notice dated 4 November 2019.
 - The development proposed is a 1.83m high fence.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The host dwelling has a prominent position at the end of a terraced row of dwellings. A strip of grass lies alongside the property, which separates it from the road.
4. The surrounding residential estate has a relatively uniform design which derives from the similar appearance and scale of dwellings and from the use of regularly spaced grassed areas which form a "buffer" around dwellings. These allow for a reasonable distance between properties and the road. This gives the area a spacious and verdant appearance, in spite of the presence of the significant built form of several terraces of dwellings. I concur with the submission that individual areas of such space combine to form a significant positive contribution to the appearance of the estate.
5. Whilst a limited area of space would remain outside it, the proposed fence would enclose the majority of the strip of grass alongside the host dwelling, bringing it within the dwelling's garden. This enclosure would unacceptably reduce the characteristic spaciousness of the street scene at this point. Furthermore, no equivalent structure lies on the opposite side of the street, and the proposed fence would consequently unbalance the area's relatively uniform appearance. The prominent location and substantial height of the proposed fence would exacerbate the resulting harm because these would increase its visibility.

6. My attention has been drawn to a shed and an area of hard standing on similar land at 67 Rampton Drift, which lies nearby. However, these do not enclose the space concerned, and their relationship with the street scene is consequently markedly different from the scheme proposed. Thus, I do not consider that those developments have any significant similarities to the appeal proposal. Accordingly, I attribute minimal weight to their relevance to my decision.
7. Similarly, I am not aware of any examples of other fences with a similar context to that proposed in the vicinity. Even if this were the case, other developments would not inevitably provide an example which should be followed irrespective of any finding that harm would result from the proposal before me.
8. Thus, the proposal would have an unacceptably harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area. As a result, it conflicts with Policy HQ/1 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan (2018), which states that proposals must preserve or enhance the character of the area. Further conflict exists with the design aims of the National Planning Policy Framework (2019).

Other Matters

9. I note the appellant's concerns regarding the Council's approach, however, these are not matters for this appeal, which I have determined on its planning merits.
10. Furthermore, the presence of other development schemes in the wider area does not alter my site-specific conclusions on the appeal before me.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

C Beeby

INSPECTOR