



Appeal Decisions

Site Visit made on 21 September 2021

by Benjamin Clarke BA (Hons.) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 8th November 2021

Ref: APP/W0530/W/21/3271548

Land to the North and South of Bartlow Road, Linton CB21 4LY

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant consent, agreement or approval to details required by conditions of a planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Abbey Developments Ltd against South Cambridgeshire District Council.
 - The application Ref: S/2501/19/COND2, dated 19 May 2020, sought approval of details pursuant to condition No. 2 of planning permission Ref: S/2501/19/RM granted on 15 November 2019.
 - The application was refused by notice dated 18 January 2021.
 - The development proposed is a residential development for up to 55 dwellings with landscape buffer and new vehicular accesses from Bartlow Road.
 - The details for which approval is sought are described as: No. 2 (materials).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Application for costs

2. An application for costs was made by Abbey Developments Ltd against South Cambridgeshire District Council. This application is the subject of a separate decision.

Procedural Matters

3. I am considering three other appeals on the same site. Whilst these have been made by the same appellant, they raise differing issues. In consequence, I have made separate decisions.
4. Following the submission of this appeal, a revised version of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) has been published. I have considered the proposals in the light of this revised document, having first given the parties an opportunity to comment on its content.

Main Issue

5. The main issue is whether the submitted details would secure a planning policy compliant development, with regards to the effect of the development upon the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Reasons

6. The appeal site is located on the edge of the settlement and therefore forms part of the urban fringe. The appeal site is near to several other dwellings,

- which are generally constructed in a palette of traditional materials, including brick, render and stonework. The appeal site is also located near to the A1307.
7. Whilst the context of the surrounding area is not characterised by replicated development, there is a unifying trend in that most buildings are constructed to traditional materials. This means that the existing buildings harmonise with each other, whilst respecting the less developed character of the wider area.
 8. In contrast, the proposed development would feature some materials that are not present in the surrounding area in significant quantities. This includes the use of concrete roof tiles and wire cut bricks. Such materials would therefore conflict with the character of the surrounding area and would render the proposed development incongruous.
 9. This is of concern given that the appeal site is prominently located at the entrance to the village. Therefore, the conflict between the tradition materials of the existing dwellings and the proposed development would be readily apparent. In addition, the general topography of the area is such that views of the development would be readily available from the A1307. This would therefore render the proposed development incongruous given the relative absence of such materials within the locality. Therefore, the development would be strident.
 10. In reaching this view, I have had regard to the Framework. Amongst other matters, this seeks to ensure that new developments are of a high quality that contribute to the creation of well-designed places. The proposed palette of materials, which would not assimilate into the local area, would conflict with this objective.
 11. The proposed development would include details such as porches, rendered panelling and some weatherboarding. Whilst this would add interest to the development, the overall benefit would be relatively small and would not overcome the adverse effects arising from the palette of materials.
 12. My attention has been drawn to some other developments in the surrounding area, which are constructed from materials that differ from the prevailing character. I have not been provided with the full information regarding the planning circumstances of these, which lessens the weight that I can attribute to them.
 13. Nonetheless, I note that such developments are generally located in less prominent areas of the surrounding area. In result, they do not have the same adverse effect on the character and appearance of the surrounding area as the proposed details before me would have. Therefore, the presence of existing developments elsewhere does not overcome my previous concerns.
 14. The proposed development would add to the local supply of housing. However, in considering this appeal, I have been directed towards an adopted Development Plan policy that seeks to ensure that developments do not have adverse effects on the character and appearance of the surrounding area. As this policy would be breached and harm would emanate, I give this matter a greater weight in my assessments.
 15. I therefore conclude that the proposed details would have an adverse effect on the character and appearance of the surrounding area. The details, in this regard, fail to comply with Policy HQ/1 of the Local Plan. Amongst other

matters, this seeks to preserve or enhance the character of the local urban and rural area.

Other Matter

16. I note concerns raised by the appellant regarding the manner in which the various applications were considered by the Council. However, in assessing the appeals, I have limited my considerations to the planning matters before me.

Conclusion

17. The proposed development without an appropriate palette of materials would have an adverse effect upon the character and appearance of the surrounding area and would therefore conflict with the requirements of the Development Plan. There are no material considerations, including the Framework, which indicate that this decision should be made other than in accordance with the Development Plan. Therefore, for the foregoing reasons, I conclude that this appeal should be dismissed.

Benjamin Clarke

INSPECTOR