



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: 1st April 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/W0530/W/19/3228558

66 Glebe Road, Barrington, Cambridge CB22 7RP

- 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 Paul Davies against the decision of South Cambridgeshire District Council.
 - The application Ref S/3960/18/FL, dated 11 October 2018, was refused by notice dated 14 February 2019.
 - The development proposed is a three bedroom detached house.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. The description of development in the heading above has been taken from the planning application form, which differs from that on the Council's decision notice. In Part E of the appeal form it is stated that the description of development has not changed and neither of the main parties has provided written confirmation that a revised description of development has been agreed. Accordingly, I have used the one given on the original application.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The host dwelling is a semi-detached property with a prominent position at the edge of the village. A public right of way leaves the road and passes across the open landscape of fields which lies adjacent to the dwelling. The surrounding residential area of generally well-spaced dwellings with generously sized front gardens gives the area a spacious appearance.
5. The appeal site is an area of garden to the side of the host dwelling. It currently accommodates a single storey garage. The low height and limited footprint of this building allow for a spaciousness at the side of the dwelling which is consistent with the prevailing pattern of development.
6. The proposed dwelling's two-storey height close to the host dwelling would be at odds with the generous spacing of properties elsewhere on the street. Its relatively narrow front garden would give rise to a cramped appearance. For these reasons the proposal would appear incongruous within the characteristic

spaciousness of the prevailing pattern of development, with resulting unacceptable harm to the appearance of the area.

7. A combination of mature hedgerow and a line of fenceposts forms the boundary between the appeal site and the adjacent open fields. The garage and both floors of the host dwelling are visible from the public right of way due to gaps between the fenceposts. These buildings have a neutral effect within views from the path, as they follow the approximate building line of their row and have a similar scale and materials to surrounding development.
8. The appeal proposes the replacement of the line of posts with hedgerow. However, any visual benefits from the softening of the edge of the village by natural form would be undermined by the incongruity of the proposal within the prevailing pattern of development, which would be particularly apparent in view of its prominent location and its close proximity to the boundary with countryside. Thus, this is a benefit to which I attach only minimal weight.
9. The proposal would therefore result in unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the area, contrary to Policy HQ/1 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan (2018), which states that development proposals must be appropriate in terms of scale and siting in relation to the surrounding area.

Other Matters

10. The appeal proposal would supply one dwelling. Furthermore, I have no evidential basis which may suggest a shortfall in housing supply in the district. The contribution which the proposal would make to housing supply would therefore be very limited. The weight which I attach to the housing supply benefits of the proposal is consequently correspondingly limited.
11. If I were to concur with the submission that the proposal would not cause unacceptable harm to the living conditions of the occupiers of the host dwelling, this would be a neutral matter and hence it would not outweigh the identified harm.
12. Whilst I note the parish council's support for the proposal, only minimal reasons for this stance are before me. Furthermore, there is nothing before me to suggest that a scheme elsewhere in the village, which is referred to by way of comparison, is sufficiently comparable to the appeal proposal to provide a precedent. Even if this were the case, the other development would not inevitably provide an example which should be followed irrespective of any finding that harm would result from the proposal before me. As a result, I attach only minimal weight to this submission in determining the appeal.

Conclusion

13. Whilst I acknowledge that the proposal would carry modest public benefits, they do not outweigh the identified unacceptable harm. Accordingly, for the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

C Beeby

INSPECTOR