

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 March 2024

by P Eggleton BSc(Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12 April 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/W0530/D/24/3336336

8 Barrowcrofts, Histon, Cambridgeshire CB24 9EU

- 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 Jack Haughton against the decision of South Cambridgeshire District Council.
 - The application Ref 23/03742/HFUL, dated 3 October 2023, was refused by notice dated 18 December 2023.
 - The development proposed is a 3.2m x 2.7m cycle storage shed beside driveway.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The proposal would result in a large timber building with a white roller shutter door, in front of the dwelling and near the head of Borrowcrofts cul-de-sac. The structure would be screened to a large extent from Cottenham Road by the existing hedge providing it was retained and maintained at its current height. It would, however, be clearly evident and prominent in views when within the cul-de-sac. The white roller shutter door would be particularly evident. A building of this size, in this specific location and with the proposed materials, would detract from the character and appearance of this area.
 4. Whilst there is no objection to the principle of such a facility and there is policy support for such provision, the specific location proposed represents particularly poor design. Whilst it offers direct access from the driveway, it is unclear why this could not equally be achieved to the side of the house or improved access made to a facility that would be less prominent to the side or rear. It is accepted that there are clear views from the path to the rear of the house but such buildings are more common features in rear gardens. Although a justification has been provided for the specific location proposed, this does not address the potential for less prominent locations within the garden.
 5. There are other buildings in the cul-de-sac which have similar characteristics, including the white doors. The garages to the sides of properties are less
-

prominent in views. The garages at the head of Borrowcrofts are not positive design features and do not suggest that new, equally prominent additions would not be harmful. In any event, this proposal must be considered against the current development plan policies. Overall, whilst there is substantial support for the use of bicycles and the storage needs associated with them, as it has not been demonstrated that these requirements could not be met in a less intrusive location, the proposal represents poor design. In these circumstances, the benefits of this provision do not outweigh the harm that would result from the use of this particular location, particularly given the proposed front elevation materials.

6. The proposal conflicts with the design aspirations of policy HQ/1 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018. It also conflicts with the aspirations of policy HIM/01 of the Histon and Impington Neighbourhood Plan 2020 - 2031 (2021) as it fails to contribute positively to the quality and character of the area. The Supplementary Planning Document: Histon and Impington Village Design Guide (2020) advises that cycle parking and garages should have minimal visual impact. There would also be conflict with the *National Planning Policy Framework* 2023 as although the building would function well, it would not add to the overall quality of the area and would not represent good design in this particular context.
7. I have had regard to the personal circumstances of the appellant and the benefits of more sustainable means of transport. I am also mindful that no adverse responses were received from neighbouring residents. Whilst these are matters that offer considerable weight in favour of the principle of the development, as less intrusive locations for the works and improved materials are likely to be achievable, these matters do not outweigh my concerns. I therefore dismiss the appeal.

Peter Eggleton

INSPECTOR