



Appeal Decision

Hearing held on 13 February 2008
Site visit made on 13 February 2008

by **Christopher Bowden** MA (Oxon)

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State
for Communities and Local Government

The Planning Inspectorate
4/11 Eagle Wing
Temple Quay House
2 The Square
Temple Quay
Bristol BS1 6PN

☎ 0117 372 6372
email: enquiries@pins.gsi.gov.uk

Decision date:
3 April 2008

Appeal Ref: APP/W0530/A/07/2045990

Land at the rear of 9-17 Grange Road, Ickleton, Essex CB10 1SZ

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant outline planning permission.
- The appeal is made by Rowe Build and Development Limited against the decision of South Cambridgeshire District Council.
- The application Ref. S/0048/07/O, dated 22 December 2006, was refused by notice dated 10 April 2007.
- The development proposed is a single-storey dwelling.

Decision

1. I dismiss the appeal.

Procedural matters

2. The application was for outline planning permission, with scale, layout and access for consideration at this stage and appearance and landscaping considered later.
3. Policy HG11 (4) of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004 (LP), cited in the decision notice, has been superseded by Policies DP/2 and DP/7 of the South Cambridgeshire District Council Local Development Framework Development Control Policies Development Plan Document, adopted in July 2007 (LDF). I have determined the appeal on this basis.

Reasons

4. The site is an area of grassed land lying behind properties (Nos 9-17) fronting Grange Road on the edge of Ickleton. The character of this part of the village is strongly rural, with open fields beyond the site to the south-east, to the south-west of Nos 19 and 21 Grange Road, and on the other side of the road. The site lies between the gardens of Nos 19/21 and other gardens to the north-east, including those of houses fronting Coploe Road. The site is thus part of a green and largely open area, free of structures of significant size, providing a transition from the development along the road frontages to the countryside beyond.
5. Although single-storey, the proposed dwelling would nevertheless be of significant size in terms of height, width and depth. An appreciable proportion of the site would be covered by building or hardstanding. Whilst the height and overall footprint of the dwelling would be broadly comparable with those of the bungalows at Nos 19 and 21 its scale would have a significant impact on the

openness of this site, despite the setbacks from the boundaries proposed. I accept that the dwelling would be largely screened from the public domain by existing houses and vegetation but there would be glimpses of it from various perspectives. In particular, built form would be plainly visible from Grange Road down the access way, where currently there are views across the site to the trees and countryside beyond. I do not consider that the lower level of the site would lessen the visual impact significantly. The dwelling would also be seen clearly from the backs of neighbouring houses, though landscaping could mitigate the effect over time.

6. Thus, whilst the dwelling would be within the defined village framework and would not extend the village into the open countryside, it would, by virtue of its scale, damage the open and rural character of the area and the transition to the countryside at the village edge. The proposal would not therefore be sufficiently sensitive to the character of the location, notwithstanding the intention to use external materials evoking a rural building.
7. Although it is unclear whether the site constitutes previously developed land, I recognise that the proposal would make more efficient use for residential purposes of land not currently in beneficial use. However, I do not consider that this would outweigh the harmful effects of the appeal scheme.
8. I conclude that the proposed dwelling would have a materially harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area. As such, it would conflict with the objectives of LDF Policies DP/2 and DP/7.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Christopher Bowden

INSPECTOR

APPEARANCES

FOR THE APPELLANT:

Mr P Kratz BA (Hons) Solicitor Nabarro
LMRTPI

Mr P Rowe Rowe Build and Development Limited

FOR THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY:

Mr J Koch Dip Tp MRTPI Appeals Manager

DOCUMENT

- 1 Representation from occupiers of 11 Grange Road

