

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 March 2022

by Andrew Dale BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 5th April 2022

Appeal Ref. APP/W0530/D/21/3289992
90 Bannold Road, Waterbeach, Cambridge CB25 9LQ

- 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 S Simons against the decision of South Cambridgeshire District Council.
 - The application ref. 21/01884/HFUL, dated 23 April 2021, was refused by notice dated 13 October 2021.
 - The development proposed is described on the application form as "*Proposed detached garage.*"
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a proposed detached garage at 90 Bannold Road, Waterbeach, Cambridge CB25 9LQ in accordance with the terms of the application ref. 21/01884/HFUL, dated 23 April 2021, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans numbered or annotated: PL-01; PL-02; PL-03; and unnumbered Location Plan, other than where the details are altered pursuant to other conditions of this planning permission.
 - 3) The external walling and roofing materials to be used in the construction of the garage hereby permitted shall follow the specifications as stated on the householder application form.
 - 4) The proposed side-hung timber garage doors shall be omitted. They shall be replaced with doors which do not open outwards towards the adopted highway. The replacement doors shall not be fitted until plans and details of their design, opening system, materials and coloured finish have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development hereby permitted shall thereafter be built in accordance with those approved plans and details.
-

Main issues

2. I consider that the main issues in this appeal are the effects of the proposed detached garage upon the character and appearance of the street scene along Bannold Road and upon highway safety.
3. My assessment of those issues is based on the most relevant policies of the development plan, which are to be found in the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan September 2018 (LP) and takes into account all other material considerations including the Council's District Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document March 2010 (SPD) and the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework).

Reasons

4. Bannold Road is a straight road progressing eastwards through the built-up area of Waterbeach into the flat open countryside beyond. No. 90 is a bungalow with further rooms in the roof space. It occupies the last frontage plot on the southern side of the road before the open countryside takes over.
5. The proposed single garage would stand close to the front of the dwelling at its western end. There would be a gap of 5m between the front of the garage and the edge of the highway.
6. The Council considered that the proposed garage would, by virtue of its siting in front of the dwelling, disrupt the established character of open frontages in the vicinity of the site and would be overly prominent in the street scene.
7. LP Policy HQ/1 encourages consideration of a development's local and wider context. No. 90 falls at the end of a short row of detached dwellings to the east of the junction with Josiah Court. The frontages of these plots, which are divided by structures on the side boundaries, are not so wide and the dwellings are not set so far back from the road as to make for a locally distinctive or obvious degree of spaciousness to the immediate street scene near the site.
8. In the wider context, there is a varied building line along both sides of Bannold Road. There is undoubtedly a spacious quality to the northern side over wide distances around the junctions with Anglers Way and Harvey Way. In contrast, most of the dwellings between 25 and 45 Bannold Road have single or double garages in front of their principal elevations. Closer still to the appeal site is the block of 4 garages at Josiah Court separated from Bannold Road only by a narrow band of roadside vegetation. The forward position of the proposed garage would not therefore be uncommon of garages within the wider area.
9. The SPD says that garages are generally prominent within the streetscape. The proposed garage would indeed be highly visible but I am not convinced that it would be excessively prominent or would harmfully intrude into and mar the street scene. Mature roadside trees would screen the garage on the approach into the settlement from the east. When approaching from the west, there would be fencing in the foreground and a backdrop of the main building, evergreen hedges along the drive to no. 92 and the roadside trees.
10. In the short-lived views that are available when passing directly in front of the appeal property, the garage would not appear unduly assertive given its modest size and design, complementary materials of weatherboarding and

plain tiles and low hipped roof swept down on one side to create an eaves line, next to the boundary with no. 88, of only 1.8 m above ground level. The garage would be lower than the roof structure over the main entrance porch. In these views some observers might judge the garage to be part of a subsidiary front-projecting ground floor extension which reflects the staggered formation already evident between nos 86 and 88. Others may see it as providing some form of visual stop to development on this side of the road which would be a reasonable design to employ at this edge of settlement location.

11. I consider that the proposed development would represent a visually attractive solution, exhibit a high standard of design and be sufficiently respectful of the street scene. I find on the first main issue that the proposed detached garage would not be materially harmful to the character and appearance of the street scene along Bannold Road. It would not conflict with LP Policy HQ/1 which requires development proposals to reflect the principles of good design. There would be respect for the Framework, insofar as it seeks to achieve well-designed places, and also for the aims of the SPD.
12. The Council, acting on the advice of the Highway Authority, was concerned that as the garage doors would open outwards towards the public highway, there would be insufficient space for a motor vehicle to stand clear of the highway whilst the doors were being opened and closed. I acknowledge these concerns. The appellant also accepts that the proposed side-hung garage doors may conflict with highway safety.
13. Rather than have the garage moved back a further metre as recommended by the Highway Authority, the appellant is happy to change the garage doors to up-and-over or sectional opening doors and for this to be made the subject of a planning condition. This approach, which was evidently put before the Council at the time of the application, would be equally effective. The Framework encourages local planning authorities to consider whether unacceptable development could be made acceptable through the use of planning conditions. A condition could require the omission of the side-hung doors and the appellant to submit to the local planning authority plans and details of alternative garage doors which would enable a car to park in front of the doors and for them to be opened and closed whilst the car is on the drive.
14. Having regard to such a condition, I find on the second main issue that the proposed detached garage would be unlikely to cause materially harmful highway safety issues for users of Bannold Road. This would respect the design aims within LP Policy HQ/1.
15. In addition to a condition setting a time limit for the commencement of development, a condition requiring that the development is carried out in accordance with the relevant approved drawings is necessary as this provides certainty. To ensure that the development would preserve the character and appearance of the locality, I have also imposed a condition on materials; these should follow those specified on the application form rather than be an exact match for those of the existing dwelling as such. I have added the condition regarding the garage doors following my assessment of the second main issue.

16. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised and the absence of objections from neighbouring residents, I conclude that this appeal should be allowed.

Andrew Dale

INSPECTOR