
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 May 2020

by M Shrigley BSc (Hons) MPlan MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15 June 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/H0520/D/20/3245457
5, Green End Road, Sawtry PE28 5UX

- 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 E Levick against the decision of Huntingdonshire District Council.
 - The application Ref 19/02248/HHFUL, dated 6 November 2019, was refused by notice dated 23 December 2019.
 - The development proposed is a proposed detached single garage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the development on (i) the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the Sawtry Conservation Area, and (ii) neighbouring living conditions of occupiers at No. 7 Green End Road having particular regard to outlook.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The appeal property is a semi-detached bungalow situated in a row of four bungalows next to Sawtry Methodist Church. A variety of housing styles are evident in the area. The Sawtry Conservation Area (CA) is largely a residential setting featuring listed buildings. The CA is recognised for the listed buildings it contains.
4. Whilst the proposed garage is of a relatively modest scale it would still appear prominent due to its position forward of the principal elevation of the host property. It would also be viewed in the context of neighbouring properties within the row which have no separate buildings within their front gardens. As a result, the garage would appear as an incongruous feature within the street scene.
5. The development would not reflect surrounding open front gardens evident in the row of bungalows. I do not consider the sensitive use of external facing materials in keeping with the host dwelling would overcome this fundamental concern. The incongruous nature of the development would be readily visible to public views from approaches along the highway. Thus, for these reasons I

- conclude that the development harms the character and appearance of the host property as well as the street-scene which is part of the Sawtry CA.
6. The appellant has drawn my attention to the presence of other garages in the wider area. I note the closest being at no. 14 Green End Road, however that is on the opposite side of the highway and is not directly comparable to the context of the host property which is set within a row of four similar bungalows. Moreover, the other locations referred to do not form part of the immediate street-scene of the appeal property and therefore I give little weight to those.
 7. I am conscious of my legal duty under Section 72(1) of the Town and Country Planning Listed Building and Conservation Area Act 1990 to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a conservation area. The garage would be harmful to the street scene which is recognised as part of the setting of the CA. The impact to the setting of listed buildings is not disputed as being affected and I have no evidence to conclude to the contrary. The development would not preserve or enhance the character of the CA owing to its incongruousness. As set out above, it has a negative impact.
 8. The National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) advises that heritage assets are an irreplaceable resource and should be conserved in a manner appropriate to their significance. Paragraph 193 of the Framework states that when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of designated asset great weight should be given to the asset's conservation.
 9. The harm arising would impact on a localised part of the CA when considered as a whole. Thus, I consider the harm would be less than substantial within the meaning of Paragraph 196 of the Framework. In accordance with the Framework this subsequently leads me to weigh up the public benefits of the proposal. However, there are none which have been raised or which attract significant weight to outweigh the harm identified.
 10. Accordingly, the development conflicts with Policy LP11 of Huntingdonshire's Local Plan to 2036 (the Local Plan) which requires development to respond to positively to its context, Policy LP12 which requires development to contribute positively to the areas identity, and Policy LP34 which seeks to preserve and enhance Conservation Areas, the guidance contained within the Huntingdonshire Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document 2017 which seeks building forms that enhance local distinctiveness, as well as Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservations Areas) Act 1990, and the provisions of the Framework which seek the enhancement and protection of designated heritage assets from harm.

Living conditions

11. Based on the appellants measurements, the garage would be situated approximately 87.5 centimetres away from the boundary shared with no.7 Green End Road, and around 5 metres to the closest window on its front elevation. However, the height and mass of the garage in this prominent position would be obscured by a boundary hedge. Thus, the development would not result in a significant loss of outlook to neighbouring occupiers.

12. I therefore conclude the garage would not be harmful to neighbouring living conditions with respect to outlook. The development complies with Policy LP14 of the Local Plan which seeks to ensure the physical relationships arising from the design and separation of buildings are not oppressive or overbearing, as well as the Framework which indicates that planning decisions should ensure that developments have a high standard of amenity for existing and future users.

Conclusion

13. For the above reasons the appeal is dismissed.

M Shrigley

INSPECTOR