



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 20 July 2021 by Emma Grierson BSc (Hons) MSc MRPTI

Decision by R C Kirby BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 09 August 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/V0510/D/21/3272233

15 High Street, Cheveley CB8 9DQ

- 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 Adam Bennett against the decision of East Cambridgeshire District Council.
 - The application Ref 20/01761/FUL, dated 23 December 2020, was refused by notice dated 17 February 2021.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a single garage and double car port on front of drive to replace fabric garage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Applications for costs

3. An application for costs was made by Mr Adam Bennett against East Cambridgeshire District Council. This application is the subject of a separate decision.

Preliminary Matters

4. The Government published on 20 July 2021 a revised version of the National Planning Policy Framework. Accordingly, and in light of the reference made to the previous iteration of the Framework within the submitted evidence, the parties have been provided with a further opportunity to make submissions in respect of the publication. In this respect, I am mindful that neither the appellant nor the Council have made any further submissions regarding the revised Framework. However, in light of this re-consultation, I am satisfied that any references made to the revised Framework within this decision would not be unreasonable to the parties.

Main Issue

5. The main issue in the appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the appeal site and surrounding area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

6. The appeal property is a two-storey detached dwelling, set back from High Street with a large space to the front that is used for vehicle parking. The surrounding area is residential in nature and is made up of a variety of dwellings that are largely set back from the road, creating an open and spacious streetscene. The proposal would introduce a timber garage and car port to the front of the dwelling, intended to replace a small, temporary fabric garage currently in this location.
7. Due to its location, to the front of the property and adjacent to the highway, the proposal would be highly visible from the public realm. Although the car port section of the outbuilding would be open in nature and some of the proposal would be partially screened by existing landscaping, the significant size and prominent location of the garage would make it a dominant addition to the appeal site and within the streetscene.
8. The proposal would cover a substantial proportion of the front curtilage and its positioning forward of the dwelling would be out of keeping with the pattern of development in the immediate area, to the detriment of the spacious nature of the site and its positive impact upon the streetscene. I am not persuaded that the proposal would be an improvement to the streetscene when compared to the existing fabric garage, due to its significantly greater size and prominence.
9. The Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (2012) states that garages should ideally be positioned to the side and rear of the dwelling and that it will rarely be acceptable to construct a garage between the front elevation and the highway. It is noted that it would be impossible to locate the proposal to the side or rear of the building due to the site's constraints. However, notwithstanding this, the proposal would be contrary to this guidance.
10. The appellant has brought a number of other garages, which are located to the front of the dwelling, to my attention. However, these are not located within the immediate vicinity of the property and therefore do not form part of the setting of the appeal site or set a genuine precedent for the proposed garage.
11. For the reasons above, I consider that the proposed development would have a harmful impact on the character and appearance of the appeal site and surrounding area. Therefore it would conflict with policy ENV2 of the East Cambridgeshire Local Plan (2015) which requires new development to relate well to existing features and introduce appropriate new designs. As outlined above, the proposal would also conflict with the Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (2012).

Conclusion and Recommendation

12. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, the proposal would conflict with the development plan taken as a whole, and I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

Emma Grierson

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

13. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

RC Kirby

INSPECTOR