



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 March 2019

by R Sabu BA(Hons) MA BArch PgDip ARB RIBA

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 5th April 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/A2525/W/18/3212695

Adj: 284 Broadgate, Weston Hills, Spalding PE12 6DA

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr & Mrs G Congreve against the decision of South Holland District Council.
 - The application Ref H22-0601-18, dated 18 June 2018, was refused by notice dated 22 August 2018.
 - The development proposed is described as, 'residential development (bungalow with detached triple garage)'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. I note that the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2011-2036 Adopted March 2019 (LP) has been adopted since the Council's decision notice was issued. I have therefore made my determination having regard to the LP rather than the former development plan policies cited in the Council's reasons for refusal of planning permission. Both main parties have had the opportunity to comment on the implications for the appeal and I am satisfied that no interested party has been prejudiced by my approach.

Main Issues

3. The main issue is whether the proposed development would provide a suitable location for housing, having regard to the accessibility of services and facilities.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is located outside of Weston Hills Settlement Boundary (WHSB) as defined in the LP. For the purposes of the LP, the site is located within the Countryside, and LP Policy 1 states that development will be permitted that is necessary to such a location and/or where it can be demonstrated that it meets the sustainable development needs of the area in terms of economic, community or environmental benefits.
5. I note that there are a limited number of services within walking distance of the appeal site such as a primary school and village hall. However, the range of services and facilities available in the village are insufficient to meet the day to day needs of its residents. In addition, the nearest settlements such as Spalding that offer a wide range of services and facilities are not within a

reasonable walking or cycling distance of the appeal site. While there is a bus service that passes through Weston Hills, it does so only a limited number of times a day, and would not remove entirely a reliance on the private motor car to access services and facilities for daily requirements.

6. While the site would not be isolated in the terms of the framework due to its proximity to existing dwellings, there would still be negative environmental effects arising from the location in terms of the accessibility to local services.
7. Consequently, the proposed development would not provide a suitable location for housing, having regard to the accessibility of services and facilities. It would therefore conflict with LP Policy 1 which directs developments within settlement boundaries or with LP Policy 11 which directs new housing to allocated sites within settlement boundaries. The proposed development would also conflict with LP Policy 2 which requires that consideration of access and vehicle generation levels among other things is met.
8. LP Policy 3 relates to the design of development, LP Policy 4 refers to flood risk and LP Policy 5 relates to infrastructure and service needs and are therefore not directly relevant to the main issue.

Other Matters

9. I acknowledge the decision of the Inspector for the case on Austendyke Road regarding accessibility to local services, however given that the site is some distance from this appeal site, and was determined under the previous development plan, it does not provide a direct comparison and has not altered my decision. Further details of the case are not before me and in any event each case must be determined its own individual merits.
10. I note the numerous planning applications that were determined by the Council in the last two years. Moreover, those planning applications would have been determined under the previous development plan. As such, they do not provide direct comparisons with the appeal proposal and have not altered my decision. Further details of each case are not before me and in any event each case must be determined its own individual merits.
11. I acknowledge local concerns including privacy, flood risk and highways safety. However, given the conflict with the development plan identified above, these have not altered my decision.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above this appeal is dismissed.

R Sabu

INSPECTOR