

APPLICATION NO & LOCATION	DESCRIPTION	APPEAL DATE & DECISION	SUMMARY OF DECISION
UTT/0781/11/FUL 2 Bentfield Bower Stansted	Appeal against refusal to grant planning permission for two storey extension	1 Sept 2011 DISMISSED	The Inspector took the view that the extension was tucked round the back of the house, would not unacceptably overshadow the attached neighbour but would be overbearing on its occupants and for that reason was unacceptable. (KW)
UTT/1020/09/OP Sector 4 Woodlands Park Great Dunmow	Appeal against refusal to grant planning permission for demolition of derelict former Brookfield Farmhouse and construction of up 190 dwellings etc and completion of bypass	25 Aug 2011 DISMISSED	<p>The Inspector considered that the main issue was whether the benefits associated with the proposal outweighed the harm that would be caused by its conflict with policies for the protection of the countryside. There was common ground between the parties that the council cannot demonstrate a five year supply of building land. The Inspector assessed the benefits – the early provision of badly needed affordable housing and the earlier provision of the bypass – were given limited weight because the inspector was concerned about the deliverability of the development as it involved the possible sale to a third party etc. With regard to the bypass the Inspector considered that its prime purpose was to deal with traffic from Woodlands park hence its linkage to the 651<sup>st</sup> dwelling. Its secondary purpose would be as a benefit to the broader area to ease traffic flow. However the magnitude of the benefit of earlier completion was debatable and not supported by evidence. He could therefore not conclude that its earlier completion justified permission. Some of the other benefits – for example contributions to education and infrastructure – were required to offset the development and others – facilities for the school, bus shelters, provision of open space – were matters to which he did not attach much weight. He judged that the site was remote and not as sustainable that land within the development limit and would erode the gap between Great Dunmow and Little Easton to a greater degree than the bypass on its own.</p> <p>He said: "It is not a suitable site for housing. The number of dwellings that remain to be built on allocated housing land within the settlement adds weight to that conclusion and militates against the release of further land for housing outside the development limits of the town." (JO)</p>