



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 July 2022

by Peter White BA(Hons) MA DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19th August 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/V0510/W/21/3287853

16 Parsonage Lane, Burwell, Cambridgeshire CB25 0EN

- 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 Ron Gardiner against the decision of East Cambridgeshire District Council.
 - The application Ref 21/00879/FUL, dated 7 June 2021, was refused by notice dated 26 August 2021.
 - The development proposed is detached 2 bedroom cottage, new vehicular access and associated work.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The proposed development is a revised scheme of a different design, following an earlier refusal to grant planning permission¹ and dismissal at appeal².

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The northern side of Parsonage Lane contains two storey dwellings, many of which have open frontages with large parking areas. The appeal site is a detached dwelling with a reasonably sized garden set back into its plot. It has amenity space facing the road behind a low brick retaining wall, and a timber fence.
5. The proposed development is a two-storey dwelling on the garden area between the existing dwelling and 18 Parsonage Lane, which differs from that considered by the previous Inspector. It would adopt many of the design features of the existing dwelling, albeit on a smaller scale.
6. On the northern side of the lane, the space between buildings accommodates small variations in the building line. The proposed dwelling would reduce the gap between the existing dwelling and No 18, and would sit significantly forward of them. In doing so it would appear unduly prominent in the lane, and would disrupt the rhythm of the street.

¹ 20/00483/FUL

² APP/V0510/W/20/3260065

7. Open frontage parking areas are a characteristic of the lane, and parking for the existing dwelling is an area behind retaining walls. However, parking areas I saw accommodated the rise in land levels from the street into the frontages of dwellings and their gardens. In contrast, the proposed excavated parking area would dominate the site frontage as a result of its tall southern boundary treatments, steps and the retaining wall in front of the dwelling, and would not sit well with the generally open areas found elsewhere on the lane.
8. In conclusion, I therefore find the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the area. As a consequence, the development would conflict with East Cambridgeshire Local Plan (2015) Policy ENV2, which relates to design, and East Cambridgeshire District Council Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document 2012, which seeks design appropriate to its location.

Other Matters

9. Other matters have also been raised against the development including those relating to living conditions of occupiers of No 18, the loss of trees and shrubs, and parking and access onto Parsonage Close. None of these matters would weigh in favour of the proposed development and, as I am dismissing the appeal for other reasons, I have not considered them further.
10. The development would contribute one additional dwelling to local housing supply, built to modern standards, in an accessible village location. It would provide a modest detached dwelling with off-street car parking. There would also be short term economic benefits associated with its construction.
11. Given the scale of the scheme, these benefits attract limited weight in favour of the development and would not outweigh the harm I identify to the character and appearance of the area, and the conflict with development plan policy.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons above, having regard to the development plan as a whole, the approach in the Framework, and all other relevant material considerations, I conclude the appeal should be dismissed.

Peter White

INSPECTOR