

Title: Appeal Decisions

Item 7

Author: Nigel Brown –

SITE ADDRESS	APPLICATION NO	DESCRIPTION	APPEAL DATE & DECISION	SUMMARY OF DECISION	DECISION BY OFFICER/OVERTURNED BY COMMITTEE
Land South Of Homestead Bungalow Ashdon Road Radwinter Saffron Walden	UTT/13/3451/FUL	Erection of live-work dwelling with link to existing outbuilding to be used as workshop and office with new vehicular access	Appeal Dismissed 23.10.2014	<p>The Inspector concluded that the proposal would “cause harm to the character and appearance of the area, albeit that such harm would be limited to the countryside setting with the immediate locality of the site”.</p> <p>He also considered that Radwinter had restricted services. He stated that the proposal would constitute unsustainable development because” the proposal would be remote from the facilities needed to sustain day to day requirements”</p> <p>Interestingly, in response to the appellant’s offer an electric car charging point the Inspector stated “...I am not satisfied that it would be possible to control type of car used by any future occupants by condition, this being a matter of personal choice”</p>	N/A

<p>Land North East Of Latchmore Bank Cottages Latchmore Bank Little Hallingbury Hertfordshire</p>	<p>UTT/14/0627/OP</p>	<p>Outline application with all matters reserved for one detached dwelling with associated garage</p>	<p>Appeal Dismissed 05.11.2014</p>	<p>The Inspector considered that the site was not within a closely built frontage, but was in as a loose collection of houses in the countryside. . The site was also not a brownfield site or would provide affordable housing for local community needs. As such she did not feel that the proposal could be considered as an exception to the normal presumption development against development in the Green Belt. She concluded that the proposal represented inappropriate development, which by definition is harmful to the Green Belt.</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p>The Garden House Bentfield Road Stansted Essex CM24 8HW</p>	<p>UTT/13/3456/FUL</p>	<p>Demolition of dwelling and erection of replacement dwelling and car lodge outbuilding</p>	<p>Appeal Allowed 14.11.2014</p>	<p>The Inspector considered that as the proposal was a replacement dwelling, and as such, subject to the details of the scheme, could be considered as appropriate development in the Green Belt.</p> <p>The noted that the proposed replacement would be represent a 25% increase in the volume of the original dwelling and its outbuildings. Neither the NPPF nor the Council's policy advocates volume as the sole consideration.</p> <p>The appeal site sat outside of the Conservation Area, and although more visible would be set back, limiting the impact of the building. The Inspector concluded that it would have a neutral impact on the character of the Conservation Area. With regards the impact on the listed buildings within Bentfield Place, he concluded that" the introduction of a larger dwelling on the site would not diminish the significance of the buildings and their group coherence when viewed from Bentfield Road"</p>	<p>N/A</p>