

APPEAL DECISIONS

(Report by Planning Services Manager (Development Management))

1. **Site:** Land East Of 204, Crosshall Road, Eaton Ford

Development: Erection of two dwellings with garages and associated works

Application ref: 1402095FUL

Appellant: Messrs Hicks, Wicks & Constantine

Parish: St Neots

Original Decision: Refused at DMP on 16.03.2015 (in accordance with recommendation)

Appeal Decision (and date): DISMISSED, 05/02/2016

Cost: NA

Key Paragraphs in Appeal Decision:

Para 5: *'whilst there is no defined settlement boundary in respect of St Neots, the appeal site, in my opinion, has very little affinity with the built up, urban part of the town and is representative of the countryside for planning policy purposes'*

And

Para 6: *'The proposal would appear significantly at odds with the existing pattern of development along the northern side of Crosshall Road and would substantially reduce the existing open and spacious character. In addition, the proposed dwellings would greatly restrict views across the appeal site, resulting in a greater sense of enclosure within the streetscape. Furthermore, the proposed detached garages would be considerably larger than the detached garages that exist along the southern side of Crosshall Road and would appear overly dominant in relation to the proposed dwellings'*

Also **para 14:** *'I consider that, in line with the Planning Officer's opinion, the proposed dwellings would reduce the characteristic openness of this part of the St Neots Conservation Area and would therefore fail to preserve or enhance its character or appearance'*

2. **Site:** Land North Of East View, Warboys Road, Pidley

Development: Erection of two dwellings

Application Ref: 1401780FUL

Appellant: Mr D Hopkins

Parish: Pidley Cum Fenton

Original Decision: Delegated Refusal

Appeal Decision (and date): DISMISSED, 11/02/2016

Cost: NA

Key Paragraphs in Appeal Decision:

Para 7: *'The appeal site lies in a gap of undeveloped land between these two areas. Since a previous appeal, which related to a proposal for a farm shop in the same vicinity as the appeal site, a children's play area has been constructed next to the appeal site. Nevertheless, this does not alter my assessment that the site lies within the open land that separates the two parts of the village, rather than within its built up area'*

And

Para 10: *'The gap in the open countryside in which the appeal site is located makes an important contribution to the rural character of this small settlement. In markedly eroding the open gap between the two parts of the Pidley the development would also have a significant adverse effect on the character and appearance of the village. These adverse effects would be visible in public views from Warboys Road and the public footpath nearby to the south east'*

And on housing land supply, **para 14** the Inspector *'conclude that the Council's approach to assessing its housing land supply, in principle, is robust.'*

3 Site: Cottage And Workshop, Hemingford Park, Common Lane, Hemingford Abbots

Development: Erection of solid structure extension to rear of workshop

App Ref: 15/01141/FUL & 15/01126/LBC (opt 3),

Appellant: Dr P Kaziewicz

Parish: Hemingford Abbots

Original Decision: Not determined – appeal against non-determination

Appeal Decision (and date): **ALLOWED**, 11/02/2016

Cost: NA

Key Paragraphs in Appeal Decision:

3 Options are proposed, Inspector allowed option 3

Para 25: *'I conclude that the rear extensions subject of Proposals 1 and 2 would fail to preserve the special architectural or historic interest of this Grade II* listed building, and the character or appearance of The Hemingfords Conservation Area, causing harm, albeit less than substantial, to the significance of both of those designated heritage assets'*

And

Para 26: *'I also conclude that the works subject of Proposal 3 would preserve the special architectural or historic interest of this Grade II* listed building, and the character or appearance of The Hemingfords Conservation Area, and so would not cause harm to the significance of those designated heritage assets'*

- 4 **Site:** Hamerton Zoo Park, Hamerton Road, Steeple Gidding, Huntingdon, PE28 5RE

Development: Extension of an existing wind turbine development with the installation of an additional 2 50 kW wind turbines with a hub height of 36.4m and height to the tip of 46 m including control kiosks and associated temporary infrastructure

Ref No: 140296FUL

Appellant: Hamerton Zoo Park

Parish: Hamerton and Steeple Gidding

Original Decision: Delegated Refusal

Appeal Decision (and date): DISMISSED, 26/02/2016

Cost: NA

Key Paragraphs in Appeal Decision:

Inspector generally happy with impact of wind turbines from a number of vantage points, except:

Para 137 *'looking southwards the additional turbines would represent a change too far in views taking in the more intimate and varied structure of the Northern Wolds LCA. The eye would be drawn to the concentration of turbines to the point of diminishing views towards the unspoilt landscape beyond, and causing visual harm to Hamerton's setting.*

And

On residential amenity, concluded:

Para 31: *'Manor Lodge sits in an elevated position from the site. The proposed turbines would be positioned in the field the property overlooks. Trees and planting on its southern curtilage would filter views of the new turbines to some extent. Nevertheless, and despite their positioning on lower ground, the structures would be close enough for the occupiers to be continually aware of turning blades and the presence of the turbines to the point of overwhelming the outlook from the front of the house and from the main garden. The proposal would unacceptably dominate the main views from the property and diminish the occupants' living conditions'*