



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 November 2022

By A. J. Boughton MA (IPSD) Dip.Arch. Dip.(Conservation) RIBA MRTPI
an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 7th December 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/W0530/D/22/3304254
72 West Street Comberton Cambridge CB23 7DS

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant prior approval permission for the works notified.
- The appeal is made by Mrs Amanda Farmer against the decision of South Cambridgeshire District Council
- The application Ref: 21/00968/HFUL dated 2 March 2021, was refused by notice dated 23 May 2022.
- The development proposed is extension to garage for home office

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the extension to garage for a home office in accordance with the terms of the application Ref:21/00968/HFUL dated 2 March 2021 and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The works authorised by this consent shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plan SRD/7815/01/21.

Main Issue:

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons:

3. 72 West Street (No.72) is a late twentieth-century detached dwelling within the settlement of Comberton, a residential area with a range of housing typologies and varying plot or dwelling size. The garage to be extended sits within the large foregarden to No.72, which, according to the Council is within the development framework. The proposal would extend the existing garage towards the front elevation of No.72 and both raise and reorientate the ridge, thus providing accommodation in the roof space for use as a home office.
4. The Council assert that the proposal would 'overwhelm the plot' and compete with the host dwelling and thus not be subservient. However, the resultant built form would still be significantly less in mass and site coverage than that

of the existing dwelling and would be close, and similar height, to the garage of the adjacent dwellinghouse. Also, given the diversity of built form and variety of residential layouts in the area, the spaciousness of the forecourt and setback from the road, any visual impact from the proposed garage extension would be significantly mitigated so as not to be intrusive in the street scene. Further, although the garage would change the relationship between the host dwelling and its outbuilding, sufficient separation would remain.

5. On that basis, and noting that the Council do not consider there to be any significant impact on residential amenity of adjoining users, a position with which my observations concur, no measurable planning harm would arise from the proposal. I find there would be no conflict with Policy HQ/1 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018 which sets out broad principles for the approach to achieving high quality design of development proposals.
6. I conclude that the proposal would accord with the development plan taken as a whole and that in consequence, taking all matters raised into account, the appeal should succeed subject to the usual conditions as to time limit and plans approved.

Andrew Boughton

INSPECTOR