



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/18/3214076

Little Common, Holbeach Clough, Spalding PE12 8BL

- 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 S Baughtwood against the decision of South Holland District Council.
 - The application Ref H09-0784-18, dated 31 July 2018, was refused by notice dated 11 September 2018.
 - The development proposed is described as 'residential development'.
-

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.
3. The application was submitted with all matters reserved.

Main Issue

- The main issue is whether the proposed development would provide a suitable location for housing, having particular regard to accessibility of services and facilities and the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site lies among a ribbon of housing that appears to be within the settlement of Holbeach Clough. However, since Holbeach Clough is outside of defined settlement development boundaries in terms of the LP, the appeal site is designated as Countryside. LP Policy 1 states that in the Countryside 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. The proposal is for new market housing, and given the evidence before me, there is

no sufficient justification for housing of this type in this location. Consequently, the proposal would conflict with LP Policy 1.

5. In terms of access to services and facilities, Holbeach Clough has limited services and facilities. Therefore, while there is a bus service, it would be unlikely to remove the reliance on private vehicles for daily requirements. Consequently, the location of the proposed development would have a negative environmental impact.
6. Turning my attention to character and appearance, given that the appeal site forms a gap within a ribbon of housing, and the close proximity to nearby buildings, the site can be considered as an infill site and lies in an area with a residential character and appearance. While all matters are reserved for future consideration, from the indicative drawings before me, the proposed dwelling would be in keeping with the character and appearance of the area.
7. While Council has stated in the reasons for refusal that the proposal would not accord with paragraph 79 of the National Planning Policy Framework (Framework), this paragraph refers to isolated homes in the countryside. Since the appeal site lies between existing dwellings along a ribbon of housing, it would not be isolated in the terms of the Framework, and there would not be express conflict with this policy.
8. Overall, the proposed development would not provide a suitable location for housing with regard to accessibility of services and facilities. The proposed development would not accord 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.
9. While the proposed development would accord with LP Policies 2 and 3 in terms of character and appearance, and would not conflict with LP Policy 10 which concerns assessed housing requirements, these are neutral points that do not carry weight in favour of the proposal.
10. LP Policy 4 refers to flood risk and is therefore not directly relevant to the main issue.

Other Matters

11. I note that another application in the settlement of Holbeach Bank was granted consent. However, given that it is in a different settlement and that application would have been determined under the previous LP, it does not provide a direct comparison with the appeal proposal and has not altered my decision. In any event each case must be determined on its own individual merits.
12. While the proposal would contribute to the local housing supply, given that it is for one dwelling only, this benefit would be modest and would not outweigh environmental harm in terms of accessibility of services and facilities and the conflict with the development plan identified above.
13. I acknowledge the comments from the Highways Authority and Environment Agency, however, these have not altered my decision.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons given above the appeal is dismissed.

R Sabu

INSPECTOR