



Planning Inspectorate
Department of the Environment

Room 1404 Tollgate House Houlton Street Bristol BS2 9DJ
Telex 449321

Direct Line 0272-218
Switchboard 0272-218811
GTN 1374

B/653/JH/P

927

Cheffins Grain and Comins
Meldreth House
Wellington Street
NEWMARKET
Suffolk
CB8 0HT

Your reference
GJH/1120

Our reference
T/APP/V0510/A/90/148118/P8

Date 20 SEP 90

Gentlemen

TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990, SECTION 78 AND SCHEDULE 6
APPEAL BY MR F A HENSBY
APPLICATION NO: E/1253/89/0

1. I have been appointed by the Secretary of State for the Environment to determine your client's appeal which is against the decision of the East Cambridgeshire District Council to refuse outline planning permission for 2 detached dwellings on land adjacent to The Limes, High Street, Woodditton. I have considered the written representations made by you, the Council, Cambridgeshire County Council and interested persons. I inspected the site on 29 August 1990.
2. From my inspection of the site and surroundings, and consideration of the representations made, it seems to me the main issues to be determined are the effect of the proposed 2 dwellings on the setting of the listed building and the character of the surroundings.
3. The appeal site is on the south side of the High Street between The Jays and No 59, and allows views beyond the mature trees and its rear boundary to open countryside.
4. Considering first the effect of the proposed development on the setting of The Limes. It seems to me that The Limes, which may be seen from the front of the appeal site over land at the rear of No 59, is sufficiently far away from your client's proposed development that the project should not be rejected for failing to protect the setting of the listed building.
5. The limits of the scattered development which makes up Woodditton were defined in a 1973 non-statutory statement. The appeal site was shown as one of a number of gaps within the area defined. The Structure Plan places Woodditton in a category of settlements where, under Policy P5/4C, development would normally be restricted to 'infilling', defined as the filling of a gap in an otherwise developed frontage by not more than 2 dwellings. However, under sub-paragraph 5 of that policy, infilling would not be permitted if the gap formed an essential feature of the surroundings. The area is also within an Area of Best Landscape where Structure Plan Policy Pi4/3 seeks to prevent development which adversely affects the landscape.
6. Although the appeal site is opposite the developed frontage on the north side of the High Street and between 2 dwellings, the length of its frontage at 52 m, in my view, is well beyond that envisaged in the Structure Plan criteria for infilling. In the previous decision regarding the appeal site my colleague was satisfied that the site could accommodate 4 houses, and I am in agreement with this view. It seems to me, therefore, that to reduce the number of houses to 2, in the present project,

would not make that scheme any more acceptable as an infilling project, in line with the criteria of the Structure Plan, because the frontage of the appeal site is unchanged and much larger than the small gap needed to accommodate just 2 dwellings.

7. The appeal site allows views of the mature trees with open countryside beyond and, in my opinion, makes a significant contribution to the attractive appearance of the High Street, to balance the development opposite and retain the visual link with the open countryside. I have come to the conclusion that even a development reduced to 2 houses on the appeal site would, by intruding into this valuable open space, cause positive harm to that part of Woodditton and its surroundings which are afforded special protection under the Structure Plan. Therefore, your client's appeal should not succeed.

8. I have taken into account all the matters raised in the representations, including the 7 dwellings permitted on the north side of the High Street where the existence of unsightly silos and farm buildings was a major factor and their removal viewed as a positive gain to the appearance of the area, but do not find them of such strength as to affect my decision.

9. For the above reasons, and in exercise of the powers transferred to me I hereby ~~dismiss your appeal.~~

I am Gentlemen
Your obedient Servant

T R W Roberts
T R W ROBERTS RIBA DipTP MRTPI
Inspector

D/21A/LP/1



Planning Inspectorate
Department of the Environment

Room 1404 Talgate House Houlton Street Bristol BS2 9DJ

Telex 449321

Direct Line 0272-218 927
Switchboard 0272-218811
GTN 1374

- 5 OCT 1989

DISTRICT NO. 11

Mr J Bowles BSc(Hons) DipTP
Nigel Moor and Associates Ltd
Rutland Chambers
19-21 High Street
NEWMARKET
Suffolk CB8 0NG

Your reference
JB 89 23

Our reference
T/APP/V0510/A/89/121059/P5

Date

- 2 OCT 89

Sir

TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1971, SECTION 36 AND SCHEDULE 9
APPEAL BY MR F A HENSEY
APPLICATION NO:- E/1218/88/0

1. As you know, I have been appointed by the Secretary of State for the Environment to determine your client's appeal against the decision of the East Cambridgeshire District Council to refuse outline planning permission for the erection of 4 No 3/4 bedroom houses on land adjacent to The Limes, High Street, Ditton Green, Woodditton. I have considered the written representations made by you and by the Council and also those made by an interested person. I have also considered those representations made directly by other parties and an interested person to the Council which have been forwarded to me. I inspected the site on 4 September 1989.

2. The application was made in outline, with all matters reserved for subsequent consideration. However, you submitted with the application a layout illustrating how 4 houses could be accommodated on the site. You submitted a further illustrative layout with your letter of 5 June 1989 showing a revised access arrangement which you consider meets the highway authority's requirements and would also keep more of the frontage wall. I shall consider these schemes as purely illustrating ways the site could be developed.

3. From the representations received and my visit to the site and the general area, I consider the main issue to be decided in this case is the effect of this scheme on the visual character of this part of Ditton Green, having regard to approved planning policies for the area.

4. The policies relevant to this case are contained in the Approved Cambridgeshire Structure Plan 1989. In villages not covered by specific policies or not having at least a modest service base, the plan aims to normally restrict further housing development, to infilling, or to small groups to meet identified local needs. The policies also aim to protect small green spaces which serve important visual or amenity functions. In addition, the non-statutory Woodditton Written Policy Statement, now some 15 years old, proposes that development may be permitted on 2 frontage sites, but otherwise restricted. The map accompanying the Statement excludes this appeal site from the defined built-up area of the settlement.

5. Ditton Green is one of 3 small settlements known collectively as Woodditton and comprises generally single depth development along the High Street and Vicarage Lane. Buildings in High Street are typically set well back from the highway, with frontage walls and hedges. The church is about 1/4 mile to the north of Ditton Green and the only service facility in the settlement is a public house, the general store having closed.



RECYCLED PAPER

6. The appeal site forms a gap on the southern side of High Street, with a frontage of some 52 m. The brick and flint front wall which on average is a little over a metre high does not significantly hinder views across the land either for passers by on foot or in vehicles. I thus cannot accept your contention that this is not an open site. I consider this gap makes an important visual contribution to the attractive rural character of this part of Ditton Green, offering both relief in the frontage and views to the south of the row of oaks and a sycamore along the rear boundary of the site.

7. You do not argue that this scheme is put forward to meet any recognised local housing need and I do not consider that a site of sufficient size to adequately accommodate 4 detached houses can reasonably be defined as infilling. I conclude that the development of this land would cause material harm to the visual character of this part of Ditton Green, contrary to the aims of approved and longstanding planning policies, in themselves interests of acknowledged importance.

8. I have considered all the other matters raised in the representations, but none leads me to reach a different decision. For the reasons I have given, and in exercise of the powers transferred to me I hereby dismiss this appeal.

I am Sir
Your obedient Servant



A R FOSTER DipTF MRTPI
Inspector