

PLANNING APPEAL DECISIONS

The Council has received the following Appeal decisions in the last month:

PA Ref	Site/Proposal	Officer Recommendation	Decision Level	Appeal Decision	Main issues
F/YR17/1116/F	218 Main Road, Church End, Parson Drove	Refuse	Committee	Dismissed	<p>NB PINS made decision on 11.02.2019 however decision letter received by LPA on 13.11.2019</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Main issue - whether the proposed development would provide a suitable location for housing, considering spatial strategy and accessibility of services and facilities • At the time of refusal no 5-yr land supply however Appeal determined on the basis of the current position - 5-yr supply available • Inspector attached substantial weight to Policy LP3 in determining the appeal. • Inspector provided a general definition of infill and did not agree with the appellants assertion that in 'normally' restricting development to single dwelling infill sites within an otherwise built up frontage Policy LP3 implies that proposals which do not harm the area's character and appearance may be excepted from the restriction. Inspector highlighted that LP3 sought to direct development to the more sustainable locations and did not give 'explicit exception for proposals that are found not to harm the character and appearance of the area'; going on to note that 'the policy is not supportive of this scale of development'.

					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Highlights that there is 'little in the way of day to day services and facilities within Church End' and that Parson Drove also 'has only very limited services and facilities' noting that 'Occupants of the proposed development would therefore be likely to rely on use of the private car for access to services and facilities. The lack of accessibility by means of transport other than the private car weighs significantly against the proposal'. • Based on the above the Inspector concluded that the <i>'appeal proposal would not provide a suitable location for housing, having regard to the spatial strategy for the area and the accessibility of services and facilities. It therefore conflicts with Policy LP3 of the FLP.'</i> • Appellant cited that the land was 'previously developed' but Inspector concurred with LPA in that agricultural land/buildings are excluded from this definition
--	--	--	--	--	--

All decisions can be viewed in full at <https://www.fenland.gov.uk/publicaccess/> using the relevant reference number quoted.