



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7th June 2005

by T Cookson MRTPI Dip TP FRGS

An Inspector appointed by the First Secretary of State

The Planning Inspectorate

4/09 Temple Quay House
2 The Square
Temple Quay
Bristol BS1 6PN
☎ 0117 372 6372
e-mail: enquiries@planning-inspectorate.gsi.gov.uk
Date

29 JUN 2005

Appeal Reference: APP/Q0505/A/04/1169728

69 Mill End Road, Cambridge, CB1 4JW

- 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. & Mrs. J Allen against Cambridge City Council.
- The application (reference: C/04/0904/FP), is dated 30th July 2004, and was refused by notice dated 13th October 2004.
- The development proposed is '*erection of two new bungalows*'.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Reasoning

2. The appeal site consists of the major part of the rear garden of 69 Mill End Road. It is some 991m² in size upon which are some dilapidated outbuildings. The site is overgrown and unsightly. Access is by way of a gated driveway between No. 69 and the neighbouring property to the south, No. 67. There are houses at the rear, that is, to the west, as well as to the south. The large rear garden of 71 Mill End Road lies to the north.
3. The adopted Cambridge Local Plan accepts that backland development can provide development opportunities, with Policy NE8 in particular requiring the exercise of strict control over development. In terms of the design of the proposed bungalows, they would not be out of keeping because of the variety of styles and designs found in the surrounding residential area.
4. However, the size of the dwellings and their positioning would create a development where the buildings are crammed onto the site. This would result in a very limited and inadequate space about the dwellings for the external paraphernalia of modern living and for the prospective inhabitants to enjoy their gardens fully. Significantly, the juxtaposition of the proposed dwellings, the small rear gardens of adjacent properties, the relatively-low boundary fencing, and the small distances involved, would cause a marked diminution in the amenities of the residents of these neighbouring dwellings through noise, general disturbance and overlooking. I consider also that the restricted width of the access drive and the proximity of the habitable rooms of No. 67 would be detrimental to the amenities of the residents of that property through increased noise, disturbance and fumes from vehicles.
5. I conclude, therefore that this proposal runs counter to the adopted Cambridge Local Plan, in particular Policies BE1, BE2, and HO5. In reaching these conclusions I have had regard to all other matters raised in the representations, but none is sufficient to outweigh the considerations I deem to be material.

Inspector

