The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 31 October 2022

by Ian Radcliffe BSc(Hons) MRTPI MCIEH DMS

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 4 November 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/A2525/W/22/3293142
Compact Car Corner, Wisbech Road, Long Sutton, Spalding PE12 9AG

- 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 M Upton against the decision of South Holland District Council.
- The application Ref H11-1083-21, dated 15 October 2021, was refused by notice dated 15 December 2021.
- The development proposed is residential development including business facilities.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Background information

2. A mobile home is located on the appeal site which the appellant indicates he and his family have lived in since 2015. In 2019 an application for permission for the siting of the mobile home on the site for residential occupation in conjunction with the car business was dismissed on appeal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in this appeal is whether the location of the proposed development would comply with the spatial strategy of the development plan.

Reasons

4. Applications for planning permission are determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The development plan for the area is the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan ('Local Plan'). Policy 1 of the Local Plan establishes a hierarchy which focuses new development on settlements deemed to be the most sustainable in descending order. The appeal site is located outside of the defined boundaries of Long Sutton. As a result, in terms of the Local Plan it is located in the countryside where new development is only permitted where it passes at least one of the following two tests: where it is necessary to such a location; and, where it can be demonstrated that it meets the sustainable development needs of the area in terms of economic, community or environmental benefits.

5. In relation to the first test, the legal use of the site is as a car sales business. Given that the site is enclosed by tall metal security fencing, and the potential for an alarm system to further protect the site, a residential presence is not necessary to provide security. I recognise the use of the static caravan on the site by the appellant in recent years demonstrates that the appellant would like to live on site, however, as

planning is concerned about land use in the public interest this does not amount to a dwelling on the site being necessary.

6. Turning to the second test, economically the proposed bungalow would provide facilities for the business in the form of an office, waiting area and toilet. However, such development could be carried out separately and no substantive evidence has been submitted that demonstrates these facilities could only be provided if a bungalow was constructed. Some employment would be generated for a number of months during its construction. The addition of a household to the area and its spend would also support local services and facilities to a small degree.

7. In terms of the community, in the context of the District having an ample housing land supply, the benefit of an additional bungalow would be limited.

8. Environmentally, the proposed bungalow set well back from the road and nestled between existing buildings with a large storage yard immediately to the north would complement the character and appearance of the area and would not cause harm in this regard. However, given its location on the opposite side to Long Sutton of the busy A17, and the absence of good footways linking the site to the services and facilities of this settlement, future occupants would be reliant on the private car to meet their day to day needs.

9. The economic, community and environmental benefits of the proposed scheme are therefore very limited and by any reasonable estimate would not meet the sustainable development needs of the area.

10. Taking all these matters into account, I therefore find that the proposal would be contrary to the spatial strategy of the development plan contained in policy 1 of the Local Plan.

11. Reference has been made to a planning permission for a mixed use development including static caravans and cottages nearby. However, as the scheme is for holiday accommodation it relates to tourism and would have been assessed under different development plan policies. As a result, this scheme is materially different to the appeal proposal and reference to it has not altered my finding in relation to the main issue.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above, the proposed development is contrary to the development plan and the considerations put forward in favour of the scheme do not outweigh this conflict and the harm to the spatial strategy that would occur. The appeal should therefore be dismissed.

Ian Radcliffe

Inspector