



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 March 2025

by B Pattison BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23 April 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/W0530/W/24/3349082

Deeping Cottage, London Road, Six Mile Bottom, Little Wilbraham, Cambridgeshire CB8 0UH

- 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 Craig Sharp against the decision of South Cambridgeshire District Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/01186/FUL.
 - The development proposed is erection of a detached dwelling and associated detached garage to the rear of the existing cottage following the demolition of the existing garage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) was updated on 12 December 2024. However, the sections pertinent to this appeal have not changed to such an extent as to affect the matters raised by the main parties. It has not therefore been necessary to seek their views and the revised version has been referenced in this decision.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the living conditions of the occupiers of Deeping Cottage, with particular reference to outlook from the rear garden area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is located to the rear of Deeping Cottage, a two storey detached dwelling fronting London Road. An existing garage building is located adjacent to the rear garden boundary with Deeping Cottage, which is marked by a 1.8 metre wall.
5. The proposal would replace the existing garage with a dwelling which would be taller and wider than the existing structure. Whilst single storey in height, the house would extend significantly above the existing garden wall on the boundary. As the rear of the house would be positioned close to the shared boundary with Deeping Cottage, its width and height have the potential to impact the outlook for neighbouring occupiers from its garden. At the time of my site visit the garden was mown and appeared to be reasonably well used.

6. The roof of the house would pitch away from the shared boundary with Deeping Cottage. Its closest elevation would also be set back a short distance from the boundary and the roof's eaves line would be relatively low. However, views from the area of the garden closest to the boundary would be dominated by the new structure. Whilst efforts have been made to reduce the size and bulk from a previously submitted iteration, the house would have a looming presence over the neighbouring garden. The combined depth, height and proximity of the house to the neighbouring garden means that the proposed development would be a dominant and oppressive feature for neighbouring occupiers.
7. The appellant has submitted a drawing which indicates the impact of the new dwelling based on a 25 degree angle taken from the rear ground floor of Deeping Cottage. Whilst I have taken note of this it does not change my view that the proposed development, as a result of its position, height and width would be overbearing and thus harmful to outlook from the rear garden.
8. For the above reasons, I conclude that the proposed house would harm the living conditions of the occupiers of Deeping Cottage, with particular reference to outlook from the garden. I therefore find that it would conflict with Policy HQ/1 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan (2018) (SCLP). Amongst other aspects, this policy seeks to protect the health and amenity of occupiers of neighbouring properties.

Other Matters

9. The Council has confirmed that the design of the proposed dwelling in isolation is considered acceptable and would have a limited impact on the wider street scene. However, the absence of harm or conflict with other relevant development plan policies is a neutral factor and does not weigh in favour of the proposal.
10. The Council refers to Policy S/7 of the SCLP which is concerned with the development of unallocated land and the location of development. Whilst the location of the proposal was discussed in the officer report, the Council did not refuse planning permission on the basis of the proposal's location and I have not referred to this issue further.

Conclusion

11. The proposal conflicts with the development plan and there are no other considerations that outweigh this conflict. For the reasons outlined above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

B Pattison

INSPECTOR