



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 23 February 2021

by R Sabu BA (Hons), BArch, MA, Pg Dip

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11 March 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/W0530/W/20/3262382

8 Mill Field, Cottenham, CB24 8RA

- 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 Toby Rickett against the decision of South Cambridgeshire District Council.
 - The application Ref 20/02217/FUL, dated 30 April 2020, was refused by notice dated 10 November 2020
 - The development proposed is described as, 'application to change part of the land to become included into the residential curtilage of the property, erection of a new double garage on the changed land'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. While I note the names stated in the application form, since only one name is stated in the appeal form, the appeal proceeds on this basis as reflected in the header above.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is whether the proposed development would accord with the Council's development plan and whether any other material considerations indicate that the appeal should be allowed.

Reasons

4. The site lies outside the development framework for Cottenham. Policy S/7 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan Adopted September 2018 (LP) states that outside development frameworks, only allocations within Neighbourhood Plans that have come into force and development for agriculture, horticulture, forestry, outdoor recreation and other uses which need to be located in the countryside or where supported by other policies in this plan will be permitted.
5. While I note the distance from the development framework boundary, since the development is for a change of use to residential land and the erection of a garage outside of the development framework, it would not meet the exceptions in this Policy and from the evidence would not be supported by other policies in the development plan. Accordingly, the proposal would conflict with LP Policy S/7.
6. Planning law requires that applications for planning permissions be determined in accordance with the development plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

7. While the site lies opposite to linear development of semi-detached properties, given its proximity to open countryside and the open undeveloped land to either side, the site has a closer relationship to the open countryside than to the built-up areas nearby. As such, the proposal would result in the erection of built development and areas of hardstanding that would urbanise the site and result in encroachment into the countryside.
8. I note the reasons for the design of the development including lighting and view, ease of construction and purpose. I also acknowledge the evidence relating to the industrial estate opposite No 2 Millfield, regarding benefits in terms of highway safety and the effect on on-street parking arising from the proposal. However, given the development plan conflict and the harm to the character and appearance of the area resulting from the encroachment of the countryside, any such benefits as material considerations do not indicate that the appeal should be allowed.
9. Consequently, the proposed development would not accord with the Council's development plan and other material considerations do not indicate that the appeal should be allowed.

Other Matters

10. I note the concerns regarding the service provided by the Council. However, I have determined the appeal based on its planning merits and this matter has not altered my overall decision.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above, the appeal is dismissed.

R Sabu

INSPECTOR