

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 January 2017

by Simon Warder MA BSc(Hons) DipUD(Dist) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 26 January 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/V0510/W/16/3160576

Field Farmhouse, 1 Temple Road, Isleham CB7 5RE

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant outline planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr C S Connor against the decision of East Cambridgeshire District Council.
 - The application Ref 16/00616/OUT, dated 7 May 2016, was refused by notice dated 22 July 2016.
 - The development proposed is the construction of 4 bedroom detached residence in garden of existing 4 bedroom residence.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. The application was made with all matters reserved for further approval. No illustrative material was submitted.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is whether the appeal site is sustainably located having regard to national and development plan policies.

Reasons

4. The appeal site forms part of the garden of detached dwelling located outside of the built up area of Isleham. There is no public transport in the area and the route to the settlement along Temple Lane is unit and has no footpaths. Moreover, although Isleham provides a reasonable range of local services and facilities, they are concentrated towards the centre of the settlement, some 1km from the appeal site. More extensive services are located a significant distance from the site at Newmarket or Ely.
 5. The appellant advises that he and his neighbours regularly walk to Isleham. Whilst I recognise that this trip is practical, I consider that it would not be attractive for shopping trips on foot or by bicycle or during times of darkness or inclement weather. As such, it is likely that most trips from the proposed dwelling would be by private car.
 6. National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) paragraphs 34 and 35 seek to locate development to give priority to pedestrian, cycle and public transport movements. Therefore, notwithstanding that there has been a
-

dwelling at the appeal site location for a long time, I find that the location performs poorly when considered against the up to date national planning policy for sustainably located development.

7. The appellant also refers to the approval of a development of 14 dwellings between the appeal site and Isleham. However, I have not been made aware of the circumstances of that approval and, therefore, can give it limited weight.

Planning Balance and Conclusion

8. The Council accepts that it cannot demonstrate a five year supply of housing land. Therefore, in accordance with Framework paragraph 49, relevant policies for the supply of housing should be considered out of date. However, my conclusion on the main issue does not rely on development plan policies for the supply of housing.
9. Framework paragraphs 7 and 8 require the social, economic and environmental roles of sustainability to be considered together. Framework paragraphs 47 seeks to boost the supply of housing and this consideration is given greater weight by the absence of a five year supply. Nevertheless, the creation of one dwelling would make a very modest contribution to the supply of housing in the area and, therefore, to the social role of sustainability. The proposal would make a very limited and short term contribution to the economic role of sustainability through the construction activity.
10. However, I have concluded that the development would not be sustainably located. In this respect, the proposal would have negative effects on the environmental and social roles of sustainability. As such, it would not accord with Framework paragraphs 34 and 35 or with Policy GROWTH 5 of the East Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2015 which presumes in favour of sustainable development. The adverse impacts of granting permission would, therefore, significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits of the proposal.
11. Consequently, I conclude that the proposal would not amount to sustainable development and so is not supported by the presumption in favour of sustainable development set out in Framework paragraph 14.
12. For the reasons set out above, the appeal should be dismissed.

Simon Warder

INSPECTOR