



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 November 2024

by H Marriott MPlan MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14 November 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/D0515/W/24/3344823

114 Osborne Road, Wisbech, Cambridgeshire PE13 3JW

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Kehinde Agoro against the decision of Fenland District Council.
 - The application Ref is F/YR23/0749/F.
 - The development proposed is for a new 2 storey 3 bed 4 person dwelling with associated parking and amenity space involving demolition of side extension, store and garage. All materials are to match existing.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal site (No 114) is located on a corner plot at the junction of Osborne Road and Savory Road. Osborne Road is a residential street fronted on both sides by a mixture of bungalows, two-storey detached, semi-detached and terraced dwellings. Savory Road is a residential street fronted on both sides by pairs of two-storey, semi-detached dwellings. Dwellings tend to be set back from the roadside behind similar sized front gardens. There are spaces between buildings, some of which provide glimpses of industrial buildings beyond. Brick or render are prevalent materials on external surfaces of houses in the area. Therefore, despite the variety of development along Osbourne Road, the street scene has a cohesive character and appearance, informed by the prevailing linear form and the general consistency of materials, spacing and rhythm of development.
4. No 114 is one half of a semi-detached pair fronting Osborne Road which alongside its attached neighbour (No 112) have an overall balance and sense of symmetry due to their similar form. The unified appearance of the pair alongside the spacing around the corner plot makes a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the area.
5. The proposed extension to create the dwelling would result in the formation of a terrace incorporating No 114 and No 112. Despite the replication of the height, width and materials of the existing dwellings in the terrace, the

resulting frontage would elongate and unbalance the pair of adjoining semi-detached dwellings. This would be exacerbated by the proposed wide porch.

6. The proposed layout would not reflect the spacious arrangement of the dwelling on the opposite corner plot, 116 Osborne Road (No 116), with its two-storey side elevation sitting roughly in line with the front elevations of dwellings on Savory Road. The proposed dwelling would extend forward of the front elevations of dwellings fronting Savory Road and would have a highly visible two-storey projecting gable extending across the full width of its rear elevation. Such features are not characteristic of the rear roof forms of adjacent dwellings.
7. Even though the single storey garage would be demolished and a small area of soft landscaping would be retained, the proposed development would fail to respect the linear form, spacing and rhythm of existing development on these streets. This would result in unacceptably dominant feature in the street scene and the proposed development would be an incongruous addition on this prominent corner plot.
8. Whilst there are other terraces in the street, this does not set a precedent to justify the site-specific harm identified.
9. I conclude that the proposed development would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area. In this regard the proposal would be contrary to Policy LP16 of the Fenland Local Plan (2014) which requires proposals to make a positive contribution to the local distinctiveness and character of the area and to not adversely impact, either in design or scale terms, on the street scene or settlement pattern.

Other Matters

10. The proposal would make a minor yet positive contribution to housing supply. Benefits of the proposal include utilising a site within an existing settlement, the generation of employment during construction and additional support for services and facilities in the local area. However, given that the proposal is for one additional dwelling, these associated benefits would be limited and do not justify the harm identified.
11. Matters relating to highway safety, flood risk and the living conditions of neighbouring or future occupiers including the quality of accommodation is not in dispute. It is also acknowledged that the appellant has sought to amend the scheme to address concerns previously raised by the Council. Even so, this does not overcome my concerns in relation to the harmful effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

12. The proposal conflicts with the development plan and the material considerations do not indicate that the appeal should be decided other than in accordance with it. For the reasons given above the appeal should be dismissed.

H Marriott

INSPECTOR