



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 May 2021

by Benjamin Clarke BA (Hons.) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: Tuesday, 18 May 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/Q0505/D/20/3251159

32 Histon Road, Cambridge CB4 3LE

- 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 Roger Trump against the decision of Cambridge City Council.
 - The application Ref: 19/1576/FUL, dated 13 November 2019, was refused by notice dated 6 March 2020.
 - The development proposed is a detached garage to increase height of garage to allow space for parking lift.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal site consists of a terraced house sited within a residential area. The rear gardens of the appeal property, and the adjoining properties, are relatively narrow. Several of the surrounding properties feature outbuildings adjacent to their rear boundaries. To the rear of the site is a service road, which is accessed from Victoria Road.
4. The proposed development would result in a structure that would be significantly taller than the existing building. In addition, the eaves height of the proposed development would be taller than the existing building and those within the surrounding area. In result, the proposed development would have a significantly greater bulk and mass than the existing outbuilding and those within the vicinity.
5. This is a concern as outbuildings within the vicinity of the appeal site typically have the appearance of subordinate structures that form ancillary facilities for the main dwelling. By reason of the bulk and massing of the proposed development, this relationship would be eroded, and the development would dominate the rear garden of the property.
6. In addition, by reason of the narrow width of the appeal site, the proposed development would appear incongruous given that the form of the extended outbuilding would not be a subordinate addition to the property.

7. Although the proposed development would not be visible from Histon Road, it would be visible from the service road to the rear, parts of Victoria Road and neighbouring properties. Therefore, the development would lead to a particular erosion of the area's character due to its prominence. In result, the inappropriate form of the development would be readily apparent from the surrounding area.
8. My attention has been drawn to another outbuilding at 28 Histon Road. I do not have the full information regarding the planning circumstances of this before me. This lessens the weight that I can attribute to it. Nonetheless, I note that the existing outbuilding has been constructed to a different design to the scheme before me, as is most notably apparent in the roof shape. In result, the appeal scheme would have a greater impact upon the character and appearance of the surrounding area. In result, the presence of an existing development elsewhere does not allow me to disregard my previous concerns.
9. I also note that the appellant has amended the design of the development during the planning application process. Whilst this is a matter of note, it does not overcome the aforementioned adverse effects.
10. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would have an adverse effect upon the character and appearance of the surrounding area. The development, in this regard, would conflict with Policies 55 and 57 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2018). These, amongst other matters, seek to ensure that developments use appropriate local characteristics to help inform the massing, scale and form; and have a positive impact on their setting.

Other Matters

11. The appeal site is within the Castle and Victoria Road Conservation Area (the CA). For the purposes of this appeal, the significance of the CA is, in part, derived from the presence of traditionally designed terraces that follow the street pattern and are close to the highway edge. Therefore, owing to the type of proposed development and its positioning, the character and appearance of the CA would not be eroded. Whilst this is a matter of note, it does not outweigh my findings in respect of the Main Issue.
12. I acknowledge concerns raised by the appellant regarding the manner in which the planning application was determined by the Council. However, in considering this appeal, I have limited my assessments to the planning matters before me.

Conclusion

13. The proposal would harm the character and appearance of the surrounding area. The scheme would therefore conflict with the development plan taken as a whole. There are no material considerations, including the National Planning Policy Framework, that indicate the decision should be made other than in accordance with the development plan. Therefore, for the reasons given, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Benjamin Clarke

INSPECTOR