

SOUTH HOLLAND DISTRICT COUNCIL

Report of: Development Manager

To: Planning Committee - 20 July 2022

(Author: Christopher English - Planning Officer)

Purpose: To consider Planning Application H14-0449-22

Application Number: H14-0449-22

Date Received: 29 April 2022

Application Type: FULL

Description: Erection of a Self-Build Zero Carbon Home (Re-Submission of H14-1299-21)

Location: Land off Glenside North Pinchbeck Spalding

Applicant: Mr & Mrs M Thomas

Agent: Studio 11 Architecture

Ward: Pinchbeck and Surfleet

Ward Councillors: Cllr S A Slade
Cllr J Avery
Cllr E J Sneath

You can view this application on the Council's web site at

<http://planning.sholland.gov.uk/OcellaWeb/planningDetails?reference=H14-0449-22>

1.0 REASON FOR COMMITTEE CONSIDERATION

1.1 Officers consider this application raises issues which merit Committee consideration.

2.0 PROPOSAL

2.1 The application seeks permission for the erection of a self-build, zero carbon home on land off Glenside North, West Pinchbeck.

2.2 The proposal is for a two storey, four-bedroom dwelling of a gable design with a large, single storey lean-to element to the west side. The proposal also includes the erection of a detached, flat roof car port. The proposed dwelling would be constructed with grey facing brick, vertical black cladding and black windows and doors with the proposed carport to be constructed with perforated brickwork with a green roof. A sustainable drainage scheme and ground mounted PV array are proposed as part of the application.

2.3 The application is a re-submission of a previously refused application (H14-1299-21). Alterations have been made to the design of the proposed dwelling to remove the garage link and amendments to the finishing materials.

3.0 SITE DESCRIPTION

3.1 The application site is greenfield in nature and forms part of a wider agricultural field that extends to the north. There are residential properties adjoining the site to the east and west, however built development in the vicinity of the site is limited and sporadic, and the overriding character of the area is rural. The application site wraps around the rear of Glenholme. The River Glen is opposite the site, beyond which are extensive agricultural fields and very few

dwelling.

4.0 RELEVANT PLANNING POLICIES

4.1 The Development Plan

South East Lincolnshire Local Plan, March 2019

If regard is to be had to the development plan for the purpose of any determination to be made under the Planning Acts, Section 38 (6) to the Town and Country Planning Act as amended by the 2004 Act states that the determination must be made in accordance with the plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

Policy 1 - Spatial Strategy
Policy 2 - Development Management
Policy 3 - Design of New Development
Policy 4 - Approach to Flood Risk
Policy 10 - Meeting Assessed Housing Requirements
Policy 11 - Distribution of New Housing
Policy 17 - Providing a Mix of Housing
Policy 19 - Rural Exception Sites
Policy 28 - The Natural Environment
Policy 30 - Pollution
Policy 31 - Climate Change and Renewable and Low Carbon Energy
Policy 36 - Vehicle and Cycle Parking
APPENDIX 6 - Parking Standards

National Guidance

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), 2021

Section 5 - Delivering a sufficient supply of homes
Section 9 - Promoting sustainable transport
Section 12 - Achieving well-designed places
Section 14 - Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change
Section 15 - Conserving and enhancing the natural environment
Section 16 - Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

Planning Practice Guidance (PPG)

5.0 RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

5.1 H14-1299-21 - Erect self-build zero carbon dwelling - Refused February 2022.

5.2 H14-0297-21 - Proposed dwelling and garage - Withdrawn May 2021.

6.0 REPRESENTATIONS

6.1 Pinchbeck Parish Council

"Pinchbeck Parish unfortunately are unable to support this planning application as follows:

1. This is designated as outside of the development area.
2. This site is not included within the SELLP.
3. It is in open countryside.
4. The National Planning Policy Framework determines that infill is to be in urban/towns and not in open countryside."

6.2 Lincolnshire County Council Highways and SUDS

No objection.

6.3 Public

One letter of objection has been received by a member of the public which has been summarised below:

- Site is located outside the nearest settlement boundary.
- Flood Risk
- Environmental concerns specifically relating to pollution and impacts on existing habitats
- Highway safety
- Design
- Impact on neighbouring amenities

7.0 CONSIDERATIONS

7.1 Planning Considerations

7.2 Principle

- 7.3 The Self-build and Custom Housebuilding Act 2015 indicates that authorities must give suitable development permission to enough suitable serviced plots of land to meet the demand for self-build and custom housebuilding in their area. The level of demand is established by reference to the number of entries added to an authority's register during a base period. The Council currently (June 2022) has 86 entries on its register, 82 of these being for individual plots and 4 groups. The applicants are on the register.
- 7.4 Explanatory text accompanying Policy 11 (Distribution of New Housing) of the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan specifically refers to self-build & custom build dwellings and indicates at paragraph 5.3.5 that "within the defined settlement boundaries there will be numerous opportunities for infill and larger-scale housing development that will be available to the local builder, self-builder, custom-builder and larger house-building companies. It is not practical to identify or anticipate all such opportunities; however, the positive tone of the Local Plan encourages such development provided that the material considerations of the Local Plan and particular sites can be met". This latter point is particularly pertinent as it makes clear that permission should only be granted for such sites where there are no material considerations set out within the Local Plan that indicate otherwise. Similarly, an Inspector concluded in three appeal decisions in the District (APP/A2525/W/21/3270402, APP/A2525/W/21/3270404 and APP/A2525/W/21/3270308), despite acknowledging that the statutory requirement re self-build and custom-build is a material consideration, that the appeal sites were not a suitable location for that type of housing. This demonstrates the above point in practice.
- 7.5 The remainder of this report will consider whether there are any material considerations that indicate permission should not be granted for the proposed development.
- 7.6 The site is not located within any defined settlement boundary as outlined in the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan, 2019 (SELLP). It is therefore in the countryside in planning policy terms. Policy 1 of the SELLP states that development in the countryside will only be permitted where it 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.
- 7.7 The supporting text to Policy 1 states that "housing needs may also, by exception, be justified in the Countryside; for example, for Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople accommodation (Policy 20: Accommodation for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople) or to meet the specific housing settlement needs of a settlement (see Policy 19: Rural Exceptions Sites)". The proposal is not considered to meet the provisions of either of these policies. It also does not fall under the provisions of either Policy 22 (Replacement Dwellings in the Countryside) or 23 (The Reuse of Buildings in the Countryside for Residential Use).
- 7.8 Policy 17 (Providing a Mix of Housing) sets out that the provision "of new houses will seek to meet the long term needs of the Plan area in order to maintain and provide mixed, inclusive and sustainable communities" and that the "Local Plan will also seek to meet the housing needs of non travelling Gypsy and Traveller households and also custom and self builders as they may come forward."

- 7.9 However, open market housing, which this self-build housing would be considered to be, is not a development type that requires a countryside location. This is particularly the case in this instance where the Council has a development plan in place with a spatial strategy setting out how the housing needs for the area will be met. In addition, the Council has an identified 5-year housing land supply (8.5 years as at 31st March 2021).
- 7.10 Returning to the requirements of Policy 1 of the SELLP, as previously mentioned, it has not been demonstrated that the development of a dwelling is necessary to this location. In terms of the 3 dimensions of sustainable development, the following has been considered:
- 7.11 Economic Role:
- It is accepted that future occupants may work locally, support local services and therefore make a contribution to the local economy. There may also be employment opportunities associated with the construction, albeit in the short term. Overall, however, it is considered that there are no significant long term economic benefits resulting from the construction of a dwelling in this location.
- 7.12 Community Role:
- The proposal would make a contribution, albeit small, towards housing supply in the district (including helping the Authority to meet its statutory duties to maintain an adequate supply of plots to meet the demand for self-build/custom-build dwellings). However, the site does not relate well to any existing settlement. It is approximately 2km from the built-up area of Pinchbeck and there are no footpaths, street lighting or bus stops served by a regular bus service nearby. Consequently, pedestrian access would potentially be hazardous due to the lack of footpath connection from the site as well as street lighting and Glenside North being subject to the national speed limit. The site is a comparable distance to West Pinchbeck in the other direction, which has no services or facilities. It is, therefore, considered that the proposal would be contrary to Paragraph 110 of the NPPF which states that it should be ensured that safe and suitable access to the site can be achieved for all users, and Paragraph 112 which states that priority should be given to pedestrian (and cycle) movements and that the scope for conflict between pedestrians and vehicles should be minimised.
- 7.13 Environmental Role:
- The site sits within a very small cluster of dwellings on the northern side of the River Glen and the overriding character of the wider area is rural and agricultural in nature, the site itself forming part of a wider agricultural field. This character is particularly noticeable due to the flat fenland landscape. Policies 2 and 3 of the SELLP give weight to protecting the character and appearance of the area, as well as consideration of the relationship with existing development and land uses. These policies are in general conformity with Sections 12 and 15 of the NPPF. Whilst the conclusions of the submitted Landscape and Visual Appraisal are acknowledged, it is still considered that the proposal would further intensify the existing cluster of built development in this part of the countryside to the detriment of the character and appearance of the locality - particularly when considering the scale and design of the proposed dwelling. It would domesticate and materially change the rural character of the site and would therefore be contrary to both local and national policy in this regard.
- 7.14 It is intended that the proposed dwelling be zero carbon and the full sustainability credentials are set out in the submitted Design and Access Statement, including a green roof, ground mounted PV array and electric car charging point. Whilst this approach is commended, this does not overcome the fact that there is not an identified need for such a dwelling in this location.
- 7.15 There are three Listed Buildings within 200m of the site - The Grade II Listed Glen House in a south-westerly direction on the opposite side of the river; the Grade II Listed Brownlow House to the west, beyond the neighbouring property; and the Grade II Listed Pigeoncote at Brownlow House. Given the location of these historic assets beyond the river or a neighbouring dwelling (including vegetative screening), it is not considered that the proposed development would have a significant adverse impact on their setting.
- 7.16 In terms of national planning policy, Paragraph 80 of the National Planning Policy Framework

(2021) (NPPF) makes provision for new 'isolated' dwellings in the countryside in limited circumstances. The meaning of the term 'isolated' was a matter discussed in *Braintree District Council v Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government* 2 P. & C.R. 9. In that instance, the Court of Appeal supported the Inspector's approach to the question of "isolated homes in the countryside", saying that the decision maker must consider, "whether would be physically isolated, in the sense of being isolated from a settlement". What is a "settlement", and whether the development would be "isolated" from a settlement are both matters of planning judgment for the decision-maker on the facts of the particular case. In *City & Country Bramshill Ltd v Secretary of State for Housing, Communities and Local Government* EWCA Civ 320, the judgement builds upon that reached in the Braintree case, confirming that the measure for whether a site is isolated is its proximity to a settlement, not other dwellings.

- 7.17 Applying the above interpretation, given the sporadic nature of development along Glenside North and there being an absence of a distinct 'core', it can be argued that the application site is isolated from a settlement and that Paragraph 80 can be considered of relevance to the proposal.
- 7.18 This paragraph sets out that "Planning policies and decisions should avoid the development of isolated homes in the countryside unless one or more of the following circumstances apply:
- a) there is an essential need for a rural worker, including those taking majority control of a farm business, to live permanently at or near their place of work in the countryside;
 - b) the development would represent the optimal viable use of a heritage asset or would be appropriate enabling development to secure the future of heritage assets;
 - c) the development would re-use redundant or disused buildings and enhance its immediate setting;
 - d) the development would involve the subdivision of an existing residential building; or
 - e) the design is of exceptional quality, in that it:
 - is truly outstanding, reflecting the highest standards in architecture, and would help to raise standards of design more generally in rural areas; and
 - would significantly enhance its immediate setting, and be sensitive to the defining characteristics of the local area."
- 7.19 Parts (a) - (d) do not apply to this proposal, therefore the only part the application can be assessed against is (e). Establishing whether or not a proposal is of truly outstanding design is invariably a subjective matter. It is worth noting that the current application is a resubmission of a previously refused application (H14-1299-21) and the design of the property has been amended. As a result of the amendment to the design, the link to the garage has been removed and replaced with a large, single storey lean-to element on the west side of the property and the red facing brick at ground floor has been replaced with grey facing brick.
- 7.20 It is accepted that the proposed dwelling is bespoke, however the bulk of the dwelling (i.e. that which is two storey) is for all intents and purposes akin to a standard cross-gable brick construction estate house, just with black zinc cladding and a large chimney breast added. It is noted that the link to the garage has been replaced with a large lean-to that would be solely finished in black cladding, which does not appear residential in design and would be at odds with the main dwellinghouse and surrounding area. The design is not 'truly outstanding' in nature, 'reflecting the highest standards in architecture'. Furthermore, given the overall scale and height of the proposed dwelling (approximately 8.1m to ridge) compared to the neighbouring properties - one single storey in height and one two storey property with a low ridge height, the proposal would have a dominating and overbearing impact on the streetscene. Whilst the energy efficiency/wider sustainability credentials of the proposed dwelling are welcomed, the measures proposed are not so unusual as to be 'exceptional'.
- 7.21 In terms of the second element of (e), the site is a 'managed parcel of agricultural land' (Design and Access Statement), that is not unattractive in appearance and contributes to the rural nature of the area. By virtue of this, the introduction of a dwelling to the site would not significantly enhance its immediate setting, nor be sensitive to the defining characteristics of the local area.
- 7.22 Given the above, on balance, it is not considered that the application site is a suitable site for residential development of that proposed. In the context of Policy 1, it is clearly evident that in principle the site does not accord with the spatial strategy of the SELLP. Although there would be some benefits in terms of the potential for job creation and assisting housing (including

helping the Authority to meet its statutory duties to maintain an adequate supply of plots to meet the demand for self-build/custom-build dwellings), it is considered that these benefits are outweighed by the harm that would be caused by virtue of the impact its development would have on the character and appearance of the area and potential pedestrian safety issues. Furthermore, the Council is capable of demonstrating a 5-year housing land supply (8.5 years as at 31st March 2021). The proposal also does not accord with the provisions of Paragraph 80 of the NPPF relating to isolated dwellings in the countryside.

7.23 Flood Risk and Drainage

7.24 The NPPF requires the application of the Sequential Test to steer new development to areas with the lowest probability of flooding. If, following the application of the Sequential Test, it is not possible, consistent with wider sustainability objectives, for the development to be located in zones with a lower probability of flooding, the Exceptions Test can be applied if appropriate.

7.25 The South East Lincolnshire Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (March 2017) is the basis for applying the Sequential Test. This concludes that the vast majority of South Holland District is in Flood Zones 2 and 3. Therefore, consistent with wider sustainability objectives, it is not realistically possible to direct all development to zones with a lower probability of flooding. As such, the document outlines a methodology whereby the SFRA hazard and depth maps (in that order) are to be utilised when determining flood risk and applying the sequential test. Using this methodology it is possible to use the information to steer development towards the areas of lower flood risks as advised within Section 14 of the NPPF.

7.26 In terms of flood risk, the majority of the application site is situated in Environment Agency Flood Zone 1, with a small proportion being in Zones 2 and 3. It would appear that the dwelling would be sited in Flood Zone 1 and therefore situated in a low flood risk area, passing the Sequential Test. A Flood Risk Assessment has not been requested given this and the fact that it would add little beyond the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment mapping (discussed further below).

7.27 The South East Lincolnshire Strategic Flooding Risk Assessment (March, 2017) shows that the front of the site falls within a "Danger for Some" hazard zone, whilst the rear is classified as "Danger for Most". On that basis, finished floor levels of 0.5m above existing ground level would be required. A condition to this effect could be imposed if permission were to be granted.

7.28 The proposed means of foul water drainage is via mains sewer and surface water drainage via a sustainable drainage system. Full details of the latter could be conditioned if permission were to be granted. In terms of the former, Anglian Water are obliged to accept foul water flows from new development.

7.29 In light of the above, the proposal is considered to satisfactorily comply with Policies 2, 3 and 4 of the Local Plan which require flood risk and sustainable means of drainage to be taken into account.

7.30 Impact on Neighbouring Amenity

7.31 As a result of the proposed development, the neighbouring residential properties that are most likely to be impacted upon are Iona and Glenholme, Glenside North.

7.32 The proposed dwelling is not considered to result in any detrimental overbearing or overshadowing impacts on either neighbouring property given the distance to the closest boundary (approximately 8m to the boundary of Glenholme).

7.33 The proposed dwelling includes a first-floor corner window serving 'Bedroom 1'. Given the siting of the proposed dwelling, the distance to the boundary (approximately 25m) and existing and proposed tree planning/boundary treatments, the proposed window is not considered to result in any overlooking impacts on the neighbouring properties private rear amenity space (Iona, Glenside North).

- 7.34 Whilst the proposed detached car port (approximately 3m in height) would be in close proximity to the boundary of Iona (approximately 1m) it is considered that the existing boundary treatment and tree planting would screen the majority of the proposal.
- 7.35 It is worth noting that given the proposal seeks permission for the erection of one dwelling, the proposal is not considered to result in any significantly detrimental noise and disturbance impacts on the neighbouring properties.
- 7.36 Overall, the proposal is considered to be acceptable in terms of its impact on neighbouring properties amenities and is therefore in accordance with Policy 3 of the adopted South East Lincolnshire Local Plan (2019).
- 7.37 Highway Safety
- 7.38 The proposal includes the erection of one, four-bedroom dwelling off Glenside North - a classified C road that is subject to the national speed limit. In accordance with the SELLP, three off-street car parking spaces should be provided within the curtilage of the dwellinghouse. As shown on the submitted site layout plan, there is adequate space to provide three off-street car parking spaces, including the provision of a double car port. As such, the proposal is considered to comply with Policy 36 and Appendix 6 of the SELLP.
- 7.39 The proposed dwelling would be served via an existing access that would be appropriately surfaced and given the straight stretch of road, benefits from adequate vehicular visibility splays in both directions.
- 7.40 Furthermore, having due regard to the appropriate local and national planning policy guidance, Lincolnshire County Council Highway Authority and Lead Local Flood Authority have concluded that the proposed development is acceptable and accordingly, do not object to the proposal.
- 7.41 Planning Balance
- 7.42 Section 38 (6) of the Town and Country Planning Act, as amended by the 2004 Act, states that the determination must be made in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.
- 7.43 The site is not located within any defined settlement boundary as outlined in the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan, 2019 (SELLP). As per Policy 1 of the SELLP it is classed as being in the 'Countryside' in planning policy terms. Policy 1 states that development in the Countryside will only 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".
- 7.44 It is accepted that authorities must give suitable development permission to enough suitable serviced plots of land to meet the demand for self-build and custom housebuilding in their area, and that there is demand for such plots in the area. However, it is not considered that open market housing, which self-build housing is considered to be, is a type of development that requires a countryside location. This is particularly the case in this instance where the Council has a development plan in place with a spatial strategy setting out how the housing needs for the area will be met. In addition, the Council has an identified 5-year housing land supply (8.5 years as of 31st March 2021).
- 7.45 Furthermore, although its design would have a "zero carbon" footprint and may also bring small economic benefits to the area, these factors are outweighed by the harm that the proposal would cause in terms of other social and environmental factors such as the site's unsatisfactory relationship to local services and facilities and the development's effect upon the character and appearance of the countryside.
- 7.46 The site is a managed parcel of agricultural land that has a distinctly rural feel, which contributes to the character of the countryside. The proposal would further intensify the existing cluster of built development in this part of the countryside and would domesticate and materially

change the rural character of the site to the detriment of the character and appearance of the locality. Policies 2 and 3 of the SELLP give weight to protecting the character and appearance of the area, as well as consideration of the relationship with existing development and land uses. These policies are in general conformity with Sections 12 and 15 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2021) (NPPF). It would therefore be contrary to both local and national policy in this regard.

7.47 Moreover, the site is approximately 2km from the built-up area of Pinchbeck and there are no footpaths, street lighting or bus stops served by a regular bus service nearby. Pedestrian access would therefore potentially be hazardous due to the lack of footpath connection from the site as well as street lighting and Glenside North being subject to the national speed limit. The site is a comparable distance to West Pinchbeck in the other direction, which has no services or facilities. It is, therefore, considered that the proposal would be contrary to Paragraph 110 of the NPPF which states that it should be ensured that safe and suitable access to the site can be achieved for all users, and Paragraph 112 which states that priority should be given to pedestrian (and cycle) movements and that the scope for conflict between pedestrians and vehicles should be minimised.

7.48 The proposal also does not comply with any of the exceptions for new dwellings in the countryside defined under Policies 19, 20, 22 or 23 of the SELLP.

7.49 Paragraph 80 of the NPPF exceptionally makes provision for isolated homes in the countryside where they are of exceptional design and the proposal would significantly enhance its immediate setting and be sensitive to the defining characteristics of the local area. However, the design of the dwelling is not considered to be truly outstanding. Moreover, the proposal would harm the character of the immediate area for the reasons identified above.

7.50 Conclusion

7.51 It is the view of the officers that the adverse impacts of granting permission would demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the Development Plan and National Planning Policy Framework taken as a whole.

7.52 **Additional Considerations**

7.53 Public Sector Equality Duty

In making this decision the Authority must have regard to the public sector equality duty (PSED) under s.149 of the Equalities Act. This means that the Council must have due regard to the need (in discharging its functions) to:

A. Eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation and other conduct prohibited by the Act

B. Advance equality of opportunity between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not. This may include removing or minimising disadvantages suffered by persons who share a relevant protected characteristic that are connected to that characteristic; taking steps to meet the special needs of those with a protected characteristic; encouraging participation in public life (or other areas where they are underrepresented) of people with a protected characteristic(s).

C. Foster good relations between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not including tackling prejudice and promoting understanding.

The protected characteristics are age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, sex and sexual orientation.

The PSED must be considered as a relevant factor in making this decision but does not impose a duty to achieve the outcomes in s.149. It is only one factor that needs to be considered, and may be balanced against other relevant factors.

It is not considered that the recommendation in this case will have a disproportionately adverse impact on a protected characteristic.

7.54 Human Rights

In making a decision, the Authority should be aware of and take into account any implications that may arise from the Human Rights Act 1998. Under the Act, it is unlawful for a public authority such as South Holland District Council to act in a manner that is incompatible with the European Convention on Human Rights. The Authority is referred specifically to Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life) and Article 1 of the First Protocol (protection of property).

It is not considered that the recommendation in this case interferes with local residents' right to respect for their private and family life, home and correspondence, except insofar as it is necessary to protect the rights and freedoms of others (in this case, the rights of the applicant). The Council is also permitted to control the use of property in accordance with the general public interest and the recommendation is considered to be a proportionate response to the submitted application based on the considerations set out in this report.

8.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

8.1 Refuse permission for the reasons set out at Section 9.0 of this report.

9.0 REASONS FOR REFUSAL

1. Section 38 (6) of the Town and Country Planning Act, as amended by the 2004 Act, states that the determination must be made in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

The site is not located within any defined settlement boundary as outlined in the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan, 2019 (SELLP). As per Policy 1 of the SELLP it is classed as being in the 'Countryside' in planning policy terms. Policy 1 states that development in the Countryside will only 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".

It is accepted that authorities must give suitable development permission to enough suitable serviced plots of land to meet the demand for self-build and custom housebuilding in their area, and that there is demand for such plots in the area. However, it is not considered that open market housing, which self-build housing is considered to be, is a type of development that requires a countryside location. This is particularly the case in this instance where the Council has a development plan in place with a spatial strategy setting out how the housing needs for the area will be met. In addition, the Council has an identified 5-year housing land supply (8.5 years as of 31st March 2021).

Furthermore, although its design would have a "zero carbon" footprint and may also bring small economic benefits to the area, these factors are outweighed by the harm that the proposal would cause in terms of other social and environmental factors such as the site's unsatisfactory relationship to local services and facilities and the development's effect upon the character and appearance of the countryside.

The site is a managed parcel of agricultural land that has a distinctly rural feel, which contributes to the character of the countryside. The proposal would further intensify the existing cluster of built development in this part of the countryside and would domesticate and materially change the rural character of the site to the detriment of the character and appearance of the locality. Policies 2 and 3 of the SELLP give weight to protecting the character and appearance of the area, as well as consideration of the relationship with existing development and land uses. These policies are in general conformity with Sections 12 and 15 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2021) (NPPF). It would therefore be contrary to both local and national policy in this regard.

Moreover, the site is approximately 2km from the built-up area of Pinchbeck and there are no footpaths, street lighting or bus stops served by a regular bus service nearby. Pedestrian access would therefore potentially be hazardous due to the lack of footpath connection from the site as well as street lighting and Glenside North being subject to the national speed limit. The site is a comparable distance to West Pinchbeck in the other direction, which has no services or facilities. It is, therefore, considered that the proposal would be contrary to Paragraph 110 of the NPPF which states that it should be ensured that safe and suitable access to the site can be achieved for all users, and Paragraph 112 which states that priority should be given to pedestrian (and cycle) movements and that the scope for conflict between pedestrians and vehicles should be minimised.

The proposal also does not comply with any of the exceptions for new dwellings in the countryside defined under Policies 19, 20, 22 or 23 of the SELLP.

Paragraph 80 of the NPPF exceptionally makes provision for isolated homes in the countryside where they are of exceptional design and the proposal would significantly enhance its immediate setting and be sensitive to the defining characteristics of the local area. However, the design of the dwelling is not considered to be truly outstanding. Moreover, the proposal would harm the character of the immediate area for the reasons identified above.

Summing up, therefore, it is of the view of officers that the adverse impacts of granting permission would demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the Development Plan and National Planning Policy Framework taken as a whole.

Background papers:- Planning Application Working File

Lead Contact Officer

Name and Post: Richard Fidler , Development Manager

Telephone Number: 01775 764428
Email rfidler@sholland.gov.uk

Appendices attached to this report:

Appendix A Plan A

MapThat Scale Print Title

