



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 August 2022

by K Ford MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12 October 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/Q0505/W/22/3298579

Land adjacent 25 Rawlyn Road, Cambridge, Cambridgeshire CB5 8NL

- 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 Laurence Haslop of Hasroom Ltd against the decision of Cambridge City Council.
 - The application Ref 21/04190/, dated 15 September 2021, was refused by notice dated 10 February 2022.
 - The development proposed is erection of 3 dwellings along with off street parking, private amenity space, cycle parking/ storage and refuse storage, demolition of existing rear garage lean to and reconfiguration of the pavement along Stanesfield Road.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. I have used the description of development contained in the Council's decision letter and the appeal form as it succinctly summarises the development proposed.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are:
 - The effect on the character and appearance of the area.
 - The effect on the living conditions of the occupants of No 25 Rawlyn Road with regards privacy.

Reasons

4. Located on the corner of Rawlyn Road and Stanesfield Road, the site is situated within a housing estate characterised by 2 storey semi-detached and terraced dwellings set back from the road by front gardens and driveways. Whilst some front gardens have been lost to off street parking, grass verges adjacent to paths along with larger areas of grassed open space on road corners and street trees create an open spacious verdant character.
5. The 3 proposed 2 storey terraced dwellings would front onto Stanesfield Road, filling much of the width of the plot. The side of plot 3 would front onto Rawlyn Road and extend beyond the building line of the nearest neighbour, No 25. Irrespective of any graduation in the building line on Rawlyn Road, the currently extensive area of open space would be replaced by a grassed narrow

strip. The scale and massing of the terraced row in that location combined with the extent of lost open space would result in a crowded incongruous addition at odds with the open spacious verdant character of the area. Design features such as materials to match neighbouring properties and hipped roofs would do little to ameliorate the harm.

6. The appellant has referenced other developments in the locality in support of their case which I observed as part of my site visit. The scale and massing of development, location and extent to which open space influences the character of the sites identified differ to the case before me and therefore are not directly comparable. In any event, each case is determined on its own merits and my assessment is based on the information before me.
7. The appellant says that the corner plot is currently distracting from the quality of the street scene due to litter and fly tipping. This is not something I observed on my site visit. There was nothing to indicate that the site generates a threat to community safety or a perceived threat of crime, as suggested by the appellant.
8. The development would harm the character and appearance of the area and as such would conflict with Policies 52, 55, 56, 57 and 59 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2018 (Local Plan). Amongst other things these policies require new development to be appropriate to the surrounding pattern of development and character of the area and ensure sufficient space around dwellings is retained.

Living Conditions

9. The first floor rear window of plot 2 of the proposal would provide views into the garden of No 25 causing harm to the privacy of the occupants given the close proximity of the proposal. The appellant has proposed an alternative layout to overcome the issue. However, the appeal process is not the place to further a scheme. My assessment is based on the plans the Council used to determine the planning application and which interested parties have had an opportunity to comment on.
10. The proposal would harm the living conditions of the occupants of the neighbouring property in terms of privacy and as such would conflict with the part of Policy 52 of the Local Plan which requires new development to protect the amenity and privacy of neighbouring properties.

Other Matters

11. The appellant has identified elements of the scheme that they consider would meet the needs of occupants of the dwellings. They include refuse and recycling, bicycle and car parking and unobtrusive meter boxes. However, these are standard requirements within a development and therefore not a benefit of the scheme. I consequently give the inclusion of these design features neutral weight. The appellant has said that the scheme would increase biodiversity on the site. Even if this were the case it would not outweigh the harm I have identified.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons identified, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

K Ford INSPECTOR