
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 August 2024

by David Reed BSc DipTP DMS MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23 August 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/H0520/W/23/3335759
47 Springbrook, Eynesbury PE19 2EB

- 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 Mrs I Manolache against the decision of Huntingdonshire District Council.
 - The application Ref 23/01786/FUL, dated 22 September 2023, was refused by notice dated 17 November 2023.
 - The development proposed is the change of use from amenity land to garden and erection of brick wall.
-

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 highway safety.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The proposal is for the change of use and a new brick wall around a small grass area of amenity land to one side of No 47 Springbrook in order to incorporate it into the rear garden. The brick wall would be about 1.1 m high, a reduction from the 1.9 m which was previously refused planning permission¹. No 47 is an end terrace house with its side elevation towards the road and a narrow side and rear garden surrounded by a tall brick wall. The area the subject of the appeal lies between the existing side boundary wall and the footway but extends out towards the carriageway due to the adjacent layby.
4. The larger rear garden with its surrounding brick wall would consequently project out towards the road, breaching the otherwise straight alignment of the garden wall alongside the property. Even with the wall reduced to about 1.1 m high this would appear as an odd and intrusive feature to passers-by along the road and an awkward change within the conventional layout of the housing

¹ Ref 22/01546/FUL

estate. In addition, the grass margins along the road and its spacious nature would be eroded reducing its overall attractiveness.

5. The proposal would therefore significantly harm the character and appearance of the street scene in conflict with Policies LP11 and LP12 of the Huntingdonshire Local Plan 2019 (the HLP) and Policy A3 of the St Neots Neighbourhood Plan 2016. These require proposals to respond positively to their context, to avoid the introduction of incongruous and/or intrusive elements into key views and vistas and to reinforce local distinctiveness.

Highway Safety

6. No 47 backs onto a communal parking area with its access adjacent to the appeal site. The proposed brick wall, even reduced in height to 1.1 m, and perhaps features within the rear garden, would obstruct visibility to the right when emerging from the parking area, a problem exacerbated by the slight curvature of the road at this point. The appellant suggests a mirror may assist visibility, but this would be highly unsatisfactory and, in any event, it is not clear where it could be mounted.
7. The proposal would therefore significantly harm highway safety contrary to HLP Policy LP17 which requires proposals to take account of highway safety in relation to access to car parking.

Conclusion

8. The proposal would provide additional rear garden space which would benefit the occupiers of No 47 but this is outweighed by the harm that would result to the character and appearance of the street scene together with increased highway risks and the associated conflict with the development plan.
9. Having regard to the above the appeal should be dismissed.

David Reed

INSPECTOR