



Department of the Environment

Room 1319

Tollgate House Houlton Street Bristol BS2 9DJ

Telex 449321

Direct line 0272-218 875
Switchboard 0272-218841
GTN 2074

FENLAND DISTRICT COUNCIL
PLANNING DEPARTMENT

- 4 NOV 1981

R
E
C
D

875

SB/1

Your reference

Mr R D Wormald
5 Fen Close
WISBECH
Cambs

Our reference

T/APP/5139/A/81/10446/G7

Date

2 NOV 1981

Sir

TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1971, SECTION 36 AND SCHEDULE 9
APPEAL BY MR AND MRS CLARK
APPLICATION NO:- F/0108/81/0

1. I refer to this appeal, which I have been appointed to determine, against the decision of the Fenland District Council to refuse planning permission for the erection of 2 dwellings on land adjoining "Ebenezer", The Cottons, Outwell. I have considered the written representations made by you and by the council. I inspected the site on 11 October 1981.
2. The Cambridgeshire Structure Plan states, in Policy P5/11, that development in the countryside will generally be restricted to that which is essential to the efficient operation of local agriculture, horticulture, forestry, outdoor recreation or public utility services. The village plan for Outwell which will eventually be incorporated into the Wisbech District Plan was adopted by the local authority in June this year. This plan identifies Outwell as a Minor Rural Centre and defines a Village Development Area within which all new residential development should take place. The Village Development Area is in 2 parts and the appeal site lies outside, but adjoining, the smaller of the 2 parts.
3. From my consideration of all the representations made, and my visit to the site, in my opinion the main issue in this case is whether the proposal would constitute an acceptable extension to a settlement.
4. The appeal site adjoins The Cottons which is defined as a Development Area, although it is separated from the main part of the village by open countryside. The Cottons is an area of relatively close development with some semi-detached local authority houses and newer detached properties. It contains no community facilities and is approached only by minor roads. In my opinion it is not a settlement proper, because of its size and lack of facilities, but rather an isolated group of dwellings.
5. In support of your clients' case you state that the proposal would be infilling but this is the filling of a small gap in an otherwise built up frontage. To the south of the appeal site there is a continuous built up frontage, but to the north it is adjoined only by your client's bungalow with a piggery building beyond. The appeal site is at present partly under grass and partly used for blackberry cultivation and it appeared to me to be part of the surrounding countryside rather than part of the built up area. In my opinion, therefore, the proposal would not be infilling but would consolidate existing sporadic development which would be contrary to the local authority's policy to concentrate development in centres which can provide community facilities.

6. I have taken into account all the other matters raised, including the point that the site is small and its development would not detract from the character of the area. Whilst I agree the site is small, further similar proposals, which would be difficult to refuse would, in my opinion, have a considerable adverse affect on the countryside. There are no other matters of sufficient weight to make me alter my decision.

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

I am Sir
Your obedient Servant

N. Harris

MRS V HARRIS BA DipTP MRTPI
Inspector