

Register Copy

Form 12

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

DETAILS OF PLANNING APPLICATION

Parish: LONGSTANTON		Reference: S/0791/88/0	
D.O.E. Coding: M/1	Map (565) Reference: 57 (75/2)	Grid E 3 9 4 Reference: N 6 7 2	
Applicant: C.C. Hicks			
Date Rec'd: 28.3.88			
Description: One bungalow			
Location: Adj. The Retreat, Few's Lane			
Previous Applications affecting this land:			
Other related files: S/1397/85			
Amendments & date received:			
Planning Committee/Delegation and date 6/7.		Date of Notice 12/7/88	
Decision: Part/Approved/with conditions <u>Refused</u> Deferred/Withdrawn			
D.O.E. Action: <u>Appeal Lodged</u> Application Referred		Date 19.12.89	
Decision: Part Allowed/with conditions <u>Dismissed</u>		Date 12.05.89	
Directions:		Date	

NOTES:

CHARGE AND FEE PAID £.....

P.C.R.N.



PLANNING INSPECTORATE
DEPARTMENT OF THE ENVIRONMENT

Room 1404

Tollgate House Houlton Street Bristol BS2 9DJ

Telex 449321

Direct Line 0272-218 927

Switchboard 0272-218811

GTN 2074

CT

Langford & Co
Solicitors
141 Station Road
WILLINGHAM
Cambridgeshire
CB4 5HG

Your reference
DFL/AMW/Hicks

Our reference

T/APP/W0530/A/89/112719/P4
Date

12 MAY 89

Gentlemen

TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1971, SECTION 36 AND SCHEDULE 9
APPEAL BY MR C C HICKS
APPLICATION NO: S/0791/88/0

1. As you know I have been appointed by the Secretary of State for the Environment to determine the above mentioned appeal. This appeal is against the decision of the South Cambridgeshire District Council to refuse planning permission for the erection of a bungalow on land adjoining The Retreat, Fewes Lane, Longstanton. I have considered the written representations made by you and by the council and also those made by Cambridgeshire County Council. I inspected the site on 21 April 1989.
2. From my inspection of the site and its surroundings and from my consideration of the written representations I am of the opinion that the main issue in this appeal is whether the increase in vehicular traffic that would be generated by your clients' proposal would cause danger to, or interfere with, the free flow of traffic using the B1050.
3. The appeal site, which is of satisfactory size to accommodate the bungalow your client proposes, without interference with amenities of occupiers of your bungalow, is at present a part of your client's extensive gardens, that lie to the west of the bungalow. It is accessible from Fewes Lane, an unadopted lane which joins the B1050 on the northern outskirts of Longstanton.
4. Although there is an open frontage to the east of your client's bungalow between the bungalow and the junction of Fewes Lane and the B1050, it is not in dispute that the appeal site lies within the current built-up framework of the village. Indeed, the appeal site is shown as such on the inset map for the village, which has been annexed to the 1988 consultation draft of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan.
5. This Plan shows a proposed area for housing to the north and west of Fewes Lane and in the notice of refusal the council gave as the second reason for refusal of the proposal that the development of the appeal site might prejudice the future expansion of the village, because of the proximity to the then proposed line of the by-pass, which would effectively go to the north and west of the proposed housing area to which I have referred. It is clear now, however, that the line of the by-pass will be some distance from the appeal site and the council no longer seek to sustain this reason for refusing your client's proposal. For my part I conclude not only that the appeal site is a sufficient distance from the proposed line of the by-pass as not to prejudice its construction, but also that its development with a bungalow fronting Fewes Lane would not prejudice the orderly development of the land to the north and west for housing should it ultimately be allocated for that use.



6. I do however share the council and highway authority's concern as to the effect on traffic using the B1050 of any increased vehicular use of the junction of that road with Few's Lane. At present this junction serves some 3 dwellings (one of which fronts the B1050) and if your client's appeal was allowed, therefore there would be an increase in vehicular use of approximately one-third of the existing use.

7. My concern is not because Few's Lane is unadopted, but because of the considerable restrictions on visibility at the junction. Although the B1050 is straight to the south of the junction the visibility in that direction is considerably impeded by the vegetation including a substantial tree. The effect of this vegetation is that vehicles would have to nose out into the road in order to achieve adequate visibility in a southern direction, this being the direction from which traffic approaching the junction on the near side of the road would be travelling. This I regard as being unsafe because, although the junction is in a restricted area, the road is straight and I anticipate the vehicles would be travelling close to the maximum permitted speed. Accordingly I am of the opinion that the effect on traffic safety affords a sound and clear-cut objection to this proposal.

8. I acknowledge that the removal or reduction in height of the hedges and trees may well improve this visibility in a southerly direction from the junction, but I cannot grant planning permission and impose a condition to this effect, because the land on which the hedges and trees are growing is not within your clients' ownership or control.

9. As far as restriction on visibility in a northwards direction from the junction is concerned, I am of the opinion that the impediment to visibility again caused by hedges would not, were visibility in a southerly direction to be satisfactory, be an overriding planning objection to this proposal. I am of this opinion because traffic approaching the junction from a northerly direction would be on the far carriageway of the main road as it passes the junction, and because of the comparatively small number of vehicle movements in and out of Few's Lane, that I would anticipate would occur would your clients' proposal to proceed.

10. I have considered all other matters raised in the representations, but these are insufficient to outweigh those factors which have led me to my decision.

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

I am Gentlemen
Your obedient Servant



T H M WALKER BA(Oxon) Solicitor
Inspector

MC 617

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL
CAMBRIDGESHIRE

Form 5
REF. S/0791/88/0

TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1971

REFUSAL OF PLANNING PERMISSION

TO: Mr. C.C. Hicks,
The Retreat,
Fews Lane,
Longstanton,
Cambridge.

The Council hereby refuse permission for One bungalow

at Adj. The Retreat, Fews Lane, Longstanton

in accordance with your application dated 25th February 1988

for the following reasons:

1. Fews Lane is a substandard access with poor visibility to High Street and the application, if approved, would create a serious precedent for the release of other plots off this lane thereby aggravating the situation.
2. Notwithstanding the above, the development of this plot may be prejudicial to the future expansion of Longstanton if the policies contained in the Review of the Structure Plan dated May 1987 are approved in that the site lies on, or in close proximity to, the line of a bypass for the village which is considered essential to its proper planned expansion.

Dated: 12th July 1988
Council Offices, Hills Road, Cambridge. CB2 1PB

D. B. Russell.
Planning Officer

SEE NOTES OVERLEAF