



DEPARTMENT OF THE ENVIRONMENT

Room 1404

Tollgate House Houlton Street Bristol BS2 9DJ

Telex 449321

Direct Line 0272 218 927
 Switchboard 0272 218811
 GTN 2074

RECEIVED	PLANNING
27 JUL 1989	
50/170/	

Messrs Grounds & Co
 Market Place
 MARCH
 Cambridgeshire
 PE15 9JH

Your reference
 SAP
 Our reference
 T/APP/D0515/A/88/112048/P4
 Date
 25 JUL 89

Gentlemen

TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1971, SECTION 36 AND SCHEDULE 9
 APPEAL BY MR H J KORDA
 APPLICATION NO: F/0634/88/F

1. I have been appointed by the Secretary of State for the Environment to determine the above mentioned appeal against the decision of the Fenland District Council to refuse planning permission for the change of use of a former telephone exchange to one dwelling at Town Street, Upwell, near Wisbech. I have considered the written representations made by you and by the Council and also those made by the Upwell (Isle) Parish Council and other interested persons. I have also considered those representations made directly by other parties to the Council which have been forwarded to me. I inspected the site on 2 May 1989.
2. From the representations made, and my inspection of the site and its surroundings, I consider that the main issue to be decided in this case is whether the proposed change of use would constitute acceptable backland development having regard to its likely impact on the amenities of nearby residents.
3. The former telephone exchange is a substantial building constructed in brick with a pitched tiled roof, positioned well to the rear of its site where it borders onto open farmland and it is approached by a driveway which leads off Town Street between the adjoining dwellings known as The Hollies and The Chilterns. The shape of the appeal site is such that the building lies behind The Chilterns but to the side and to the rear of The Hollies.
4. I accept that this application is not typical of proposals for backland development in that the building which would be occupied already exists but I have to consider the implications of its conversion into a dwelling.
5. On 3 sides, the building is very close to the boundaries of the plot and is separated from them by little more than broad pathways. Available amenity space would therefore be largely restricted to what is now the hard-surfaced forecourt to the building. Given that a part of that area would have to be given over to a driveway and turning space, the remaining area would be very limited, but garden size is, nonetheless, a matter which may generally be left to a developer and his customer.



6. I do consider however that the position of the building and its proximity to the site boundaries would create an unsatisfactory relationship between the proposed dwelling and the neighbouring houses. On the eastern boundary it would immediately overlook the rear elevation and garden of The Hollies, while to the west, although The Chilterns is partly shielded from the building by its own garage and a large cypress hedge, its long, narrow rear garden would be similarly close to that elevation of the building. In my opinion, the intrusion of a dwelling onto this backland site would be seriously harmful to the amenities of adjoining residents in terms of reduced privacy and increased disturbance while, conversely, the occupiers of such a dwelling would suffer similarly from the existing neighbouring houses.

7. I therefore conclude that planning permission should be refused and, although I have taken into account all other matters raised in the representations, they do not alter my view on the main planning issue.

8. For the above reasons, and in exercise of the powers transferred to me I hereby dismiss this appeal.

I am Gentlemen
Your obedient Servant

P ROSSON BA(Hons) Solicitor
Inspector