
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 May 2023

by David Reed BSc DipTP DMS MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18 May 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/W0530/W/22/3306653

25 Station Road, Over, Cambridgeshire CB24 5NJ

- 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 Connor Sweeney against the decision of South Cambridgeshire District Council.
 - The application Ref 22/00664/FUL, dated 10 February 2022, was refused by notice dated 17 August 2022.
 - The development proposed is the subdivision of existing garden plot and erection of a detached dwelling house including the stopping up of the existing driveway access and creation of new vehicular access to Station Road.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the street scene and the effect of the proposal on the living conditions of the occupiers of No 25 Station Road in relation to outlook.

Reasons

3. The proposal is for a detached house on the wide side garden of No 25 Station Road, a semi-detached property on the corner of Queen's Close. There is no dispute that the site could accommodate a dwelling as a new house has recently been constructed on the similar sized side garden of No 23, the equivalent semi-detached house on the opposite corner of Queen's Close.
4. No 25 is the first in a row of four semi-detached houses, two pairs, which front onto Station Road. The second (No 27) and third (No 29) have two storey front facing gabled extensions projecting towards the road, one wider than the other, whilst the fourth house (No 31) has been extended sideways, elongating the overall group.
5. Seeking to imitate the others, the proposal includes a two storey front facing gable projection, but this would unbalance the broad symmetry of the group as a whole and, located on the corner, would appear unduly prominent in the street scene. Whilst the new house adjacent to No 23 is unsatisfactorily set forward of its neighbour, it adopts a simple form with pitched roof and ridgeline parallel to the road.

6. According to the officer report, the front facing projection would also extend some 3.7 m beyond the front elevation of No 25, with the two flank walls about 1.5 m apart. Even further forward than the new house in relation to No 23, which is itself discordant, this would be jarring when the two houses are seen together on approaching from the south-west. The projection would also be unneighbourly and overbearing in relation to the front elevation of No 25, particularly the outlook from the dual aspect ground floor room, said to be a kitchen, which would be adversely restricted to the front in addition to the loss of light and view to the side – the combined effect within the room being unduly overbearing. This unsatisfactory position would not be justified by the similar relationship of the new dwelling to the windows of No 23 opposite.
7. Turning to Queen's Close, the flank elevation of the recently built dwelling is some 1.6 m forward of the front elevation of Nos 1 and 2, the first pair of semi-detached houses, but this is imperceptible and unobtrusive in the street scene. In this case the flank elevation of the proposal would be about 2.5 m forward of the front elevation of its adjacent pair, Nos 25 and 26, and slightly closer to the kerb than the dwelling opposite. With boundary hedging as proposed to soften the built form, this would not unduly encroach on the corner and would be acceptable in the street scene. However, the limited fenestration on the flank elevation at first floor level would do little to relieve its stark appearance on the prominent street corner.

Conclusion

8. For these reasons the proposal would be unduly harmful to the character and appearance of the street scene and would be unacceptably detrimental to the living conditions of the occupiers of No 25 Station Road in relation to outlook contrary to Policies S/7, HQ/1 and H/16 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018. These require development to be of a scale and character appropriate to the location, to be compatible in terms of form and design, to protect the amenity of occupiers from development that is overbearing, and only to allow new dwellings on residential garden land when there would be no significant harm to the local area or impact on the amenity of nearby properties.
9. Having regard to the above the appeal should be dismissed.

David Reed

INSPECTOR