

FENLAND DISTRICT COUNCIL
DETAILS OF PLANNING APPLICATION

Applicant	Mr. R. Honeybun, Beaconsfield Cottage, The Common, Upwell.	Ref:	F /1035/85/0 0 / 1035/85/0
Agent	-	Delegated	
Description	Erection of a bungalow,	Dated	-
		Rec'd	26.11.85
Location	Adj. Beaconsfield Cottage, The Common, Upwell.	Parish	UPWELL
Previous applications affecting site	WR/72/74/0	Grid	E 5 5 0 2 5
		ref:	N 3 0 3 5 4
		Map ref.	TF500 3 (1972)
Other related files	None.	Category C/D/L	
Committee:		Date:	16.1.86
Decision: Approved with conditions/Refused/Deferred		Date of Notice:	16.1.86
D.O.E. action: Appeal lodged/Application referred		Date:	
Appeal decision: Part/Allowed with conditions/Dismissed		Date:	
D.O.E. direction:		Date:	
County Council directions:		Date:	

TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1971

REFUSAL OF PLANNING PERMISSION

(OUTLINE)


~~Chief Planning Officer~~

Dated: 16th January 1986

Fenland Hall, County Road, March. PE15 8NQ
(See notes overleaf regarding Appeal procedures)

TO Mr. R. Honeybun,
Beaconsfield Cottage,
The Common,
Upwell,
Wisbech,
Cambs.

The Council hereby refuse permission for erection of a bungalow, adj. Beaconsfield Cottage, The Common, Upwell in accordance with your Application received 26th November 1985 for the following reasons:

1. The proposal is contrary to the provisions of the Approved County Structure Plan for Cambridgeshire in that policy P7/5 states "The construction of new dwellings in the open countryside will not be allowed except where they are essential to the efficient operation of local agriculture, horticulture or forestry".
2. The site of the proposed development is outside any area indicated as being suitable for residential purposes in the approved village plan for Upwell, and is outside the limits of development as shown on the village plan.
3. It is considered that sufficient land is available for residential development (being within the area allocated for development or with planning permission) elsewhere in the village and which should be developed in the first instance.
4. If permitted, the proposed development would set a precedent for similar proposals which the District Planning Authority would find difficult to resist and which would progressively detract from the open and rural appearance and character of the area.