

Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 20 September 2016

by Paul Singleton BSc (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 06 October 2016

Appeal A - Ref: APP/R2520/W/16/3151360

Land south of Station Road, Waddington, Lincoln

- 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 Quay Bronze Limited against the decision of North Kesteven District Council.
 - The application Ref 15/1528/FUL, dated 23 December 2015, was refused by notice dated 4 April 2016.
 - The development proposed is erection of 15 partial subterranean dwellings (including 5 affordable dwellings); hard and soft landscaping and engineering works; and improvements to existing access to Station Road.
-

Appeal B - Ref: APP/R2520/W/16/3151363

Land north west of Far Lane and north of Station Road, Waddington, Lincoln

- 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 Quay Bronze Limited against the decision of North Kesteven District Council.
 - The application Ref 15/1529/FUL, dated 23 December 2015, was refused by notice dated 10 March 2016.
 - The development proposed is erection of partial subterranean dwelling (Plot A) utilising existing access to Far Lane.
-

Appeal C - Ref: APP/R2520/W/16/3151365

Land north west of Far Lane and north of Station Road, Waddington, Lincoln

- 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 Quay Bronze Limited against the decision of North Kesteven District Council.
 - The application Ref 15/1530/FUL, dated 23 December 2015, was refused by notice dated 10 March 2016.
 - The development proposed is erection of partial subterranean dwelling (Plot B) utilising existing access to Far Lane.
-

Decisions

1. Appeals A, B and C are all dismissed.
-

Procedural Matters

2. For ease of reference I have referred to the different cases as Appeal A (the proposed 15 dwellings on land to the south of Station Road); Appeal B (the proposed single dwelling on land to the north west of Far Lane on Plot A); and Appeal C (the proposed single dwelling on land to the north west of Far Lane on Plot B). I have dealt with each of the appeals on its merits but, as a number of the issues and material considerations are common to all three, I have dealt with these together in order to avoid duplication. Matters which are more specific and do not relate to all of the three appeals are clearly set out in the decision.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are:
 - (a) whether the Council can demonstrate a 5 year housing land supply;
 - (b) whether the sites are suitable locations for residential development having regard to the Council's existing and proposed spatial strategy and settlement hierarchy; and
 - (c) the effect on the Lincoln Cliff Landscape Character Area and on the landscape setting and separate identity of Waddington Village.

Housing supply

4. The Council asserts that it is able to demonstrate a 5 year forward Housing Land Supply (HLS) as required under paragraph 49 of the National Planning Policy Framework (Framework). That position is founded on a housing requirement of 36,960 dwellings in the period between 2012 and 2036 as set out in the submission draft of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan (CLLP) which has been prepared by the Council jointly with the two neighbouring local authorities. The submission draft was approved in April 2016 and has been submitted for examination in November, with adoption by the Council potentially following early in 2017.
5. Based on the CLLP assessment of housing need, allowing for completions and a record of under-delivery in the initial plan period (1 April 2012 to 31 March 2015), the 5 year requirement is for 11,225 new dwellings and the available supply is assessed as being sufficient to provide 12,059 dwellings. However, whilst this indicates a 5.37 years HLS, some 7,069 of those dwellings, equating to more than 58% of the identified supply, are predicted to be met by sites without planning permission which are allocated in the CLLP.
6. Paragraph 49 of the Framework requires that the sites included within the 5 year HLS should be deliverable and Footnote 11 to that document clarifies that, for a site to be deliverable it should be available now, offer a suitable location for development now, and be achievable with a realistic prospect that housing will be delivered on the site within 5 years. Planning Practice Guidance provides that planning permission or an allocation in a development plan is not a prerequisite for a site being deliverable in terms of the five year supply but states that local planning authorities will need to provide robust and up to date evidence to support the deliverability of sites¹.

¹ PPG ID:3-031-20140306

7. Sites in emerging local plans can be included in the 5 year HLS but the issue of what weight can be given to such allocations has to be considered in light of case law established in the judgment in *Wainhomes v Secretary of State*². In that case the judge ruled that, where sites are in contemplation because of being included in an emerging policy document, and that document is still subject to public examination, that must increase the lack of certainty as to the outcome and there can be no guarantee that sites included in the draft plan will remain in the final version of the Local Plan (paragraph 34). The judge went on to state that, in the absence of site specific evidence, it cannot either be assumed or guaranteed that sites so included are deliverable and that the only safe assumption is that not all such sites are deliverable.
8. This judgment was referred to in the decision on an appeal in Saxilby (APP/N2535/A/14/2223170), issued in December 2015, in which Inspector Manning concluded that the CLLP was insufficiently advanced for him to place decisive weight on its provisions as a reliable source of land supply. That approach has been followed by a number of other inspectors in the various appeals appended to the appellant's written statement, the most recent of which, concerning a housing proposal in Navenby (APP/R2520/W/15/3132823), was issued in May 2016 following the Council's approval of the submission draft of the CLLP. In that decision, Inspector Wood found that only limited weight could be given to the provisions of the CLLP due to the early stage of preparation that it has reached and that it would be inappropriate to rely on its provisions in calculating the supply of housing sites. Accordingly, he determined the appeal on the basis that the Council is not able to demonstrate a 5 year HLS.
9. The appellant has advised that objections have been made to the soundness of the CLLP and, although I have no information as to what objections have been submitted to the various housing site allocations, neither has any evidence been put to me to demonstrate the deliverability of the sites which make up over 56% of the 5 year HLS. Hence, I have no evidence which would lead me to a different conclusion than that reached by the other inspectors referred to above as regards the limited weight that can be placed on the emerging plan's provisions as a reliable source of land supply. Accordingly, I find that the Council is unable to demonstrate a 5 year supply of deliverable sites and that the relevant policies within the development plan for the delivery of housing should, therefore be treated as being out of date.
10. Paragraph 14 of the Framework advises that, in these circumstances, the presumption in favour of sustainable development means that planning permission should be granted unless any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against the policies in the Framework as a whole.

Suitability of sites

11. All 3 sites immediately adjoin but lie outside of the development limits of Waddington and Waddington Low Fields as defined in the North Kesteven Local Plan adopted in 2007 (NKLP) and are treated under the provisions of that plan as being within the open countryside. The Council accepts that NKLP Policy C2 does not rule out development adjacent to existing settlements but permission for such development would only be granted if a number of conditions are met.

² *Wainhomes (South West) Holdings Ltd v SSCLG* [2013] EWHC 587 (Admin)

The explanatory text to the policy states that the countryside should be safeguarded for its own sake and that development within it must be strictly controlled in order to avoid patterns of development which are not accessible to all sections of the community, where journeys will be of greater length, where people will have little choice about how they travel, and that cannot be serviced efficiently.

12. In the Court of Appeal judgment in the Suffolk Coastal and Richborough Estates cases³ the Court ruled that 'relevant policies' for the supply of housing include policies that influence the supply of housing by restricting the locations where new houses may be developed, such as policies for the protection of the countryside. I consider that Policy C2 is such a policy and should be considered to be out of date in light of my conclusions as to the absence of a 5 year HLS. I also consider that its central objective of protecting the countryside for its own sake is inconsistent with the Framework's policies in respect of the countryside which do not include any such blanket protection; the Policy should, therefore, also be given reduced weight in accordance with the advice set out in paragraph 215 of the Framework.
13. Whilst NKLP Policy C2 remains a material consideration, the weight that can be given to it is significantly reduced for the reasons set out above, and preference should be given to the Framework policies concerning development in the countryside. Key amongst these is paragraph 55 which states that, to promote sustainable development in rural areas, housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities and that local planning authorities should avoid isolated new homes in the countryside unless there are special circumstances.
14. All of the sites immediately adjoin the development limits of a Tier 2 settlement as defined in NKLP and none of the appeal proposals would involve the development of isolated new homes. The future occupiers of the proposed dwellings would help to support the viability of local shops and services and would add to the vitality of Waddington as a rural community. The proposals would be therefore consistent with paragraph 55 and, as is accepted by the Council, all 3 sites could be considered to be sustainable locations for new housing when judged against the Framework's policies, subject to my assessment of their environmental effects.
15. This conclusion is supported by the CLLP which abandons the concept of development limits in favour of a spatial strategy and settlement hierarchy and defines the sites as being adjacent to the Lincoln Urban Area. Draft Policy LP2 indicates that this area should be the principal focus for development in Central Lincolnshire and states that additional growth on non-allocated sites in appropriate locations will be considered favourably. The sites would comprise 'appropriate locations' in terms of their proximity to the existing village and the services it provides; the proposals would, therefore, comply with the spatial strategy of the emerging plan.
16. Due to the location of the sites and their accessibility to local services, and the economic and social benefits that the proposals would bring, I consider that all three proposals would support the economic and social dimensions of sustainable development as set out in the Framework. The key issues for

³ Suffolk Coastal District Council v Hopkins Homes Ltd; Richborough Estates Partnership LLP v Cheshire East, SSCLG [2016] EWCA Civ 168.

consideration are accordingly whether their environmental effects would give rise to any conflict with the development plan and whether those impacts would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits of the proposals.

Landscape character and setting

17. All 3 sites are located within the Lincoln Cliff Landscape Character Area (LCLCA) which is covered by the provisions of saved NKLP Policy LW1. This states that the Council will seek to protect the distinctive landscapes of the identified Landscape Character Areas and that, where development is considered acceptable, it will be required to contribute to local distinctiveness and be well integrated into the local landscape character, to protect any features of importance to the local scene, and to respect important views.
18. I note the appellant's contention that NKLP Policy LW1 should also be treated as a relevant policy for the supply of housing and the reference made to the decision in the appeals in Rothley, Leicestershire (APP/X2410/A/13/2196928 & 2196929) in support of that argument. However, it seems to me that, unlike the key policy relating to designated Areas of Landscape Value that was considered in those appeals, Policy LW1 does not impose a blanket ban on development in identified Landscape Character Areas. This is clear from the wording of the policy itself and from paragraph 10.11, which states that the Council does not expect the area's landscape to remain unchanged and is concerned to ensure that new development does not harm landscape quality.
19. All 3 sites are included in a proposed Area of Great Landscape Value (AGLV) under draft CLLP Policy LP17 and within a proposed Green Wedge under draft Policy LP21 but I am advised that the appellant has objected to their inclusion within the Green Wedge. Although the policies of the CLLP can be afforded only limited weight at this stage, the proposed designation of the Lincoln Cliff area as an AGLV confirms its importance as one of the most renowned and locally valued landscape features in the district.
20. NKLP identifies the Lincoln Cliff as the most physically dominant feature in the district and states that, in the context of relatively flat land to both sides, its visual significance is greatly enhanced. The North Kesteven Landscape Character Assessment (2007) (NKLCA) identifies the Cliff as being particularly sensitive to the impact of new development and states that the striking topography, pattern and character of the villages within their countryside setting would be significantly harmed through poorly located development. The appellant agrees that no unacceptable harm should be caused to the LCLCA and asserts that the proposals have been designed to ensure this outcome.

Appeal A

21. The site occupies the mid-slopes of the Cliff with the steeper and higher slopes rising behind it. The appellant's Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) notes that this location leads to it being partially exposed and that, although enclosed by vegetation, the currently open nature of the field stands out in views from the west. My observations on my site visit support both that analysis and the LVIA's conclusions that the existing trees and hedgerows to the site boundaries make a positive contribution to the character of the Cliff slopes and soften the visibility of existing built form in these views.

22. The proposed development would not rise above the ridge or break the skyline when seen from the west and south west. However, it would result in the loss of that currently open land and its replacement by development of a distinctly urban character. The partially subterranean form of the proposed dwellings and use of flat roofs would minimise their overall height but their contemporary design would make them more noticeable because they would be so different from the majority of the housing development within the local area. The dwellings on the higher part of the site and those close to its southern boundary would present full two story elevations to the south west. The appellant's visualisations show that these would be prominent from Landscape Viewpoints 01 and 02 and would be visible from 03; the built form of the dwellings and extensive glazing to the front elevations would add to that prominence and make them appear somewhat incongruous in those views. The green roofs would do little to mitigate this effect because of the lower lying position of those viewpoints.
23. The loss from those views of a currently open field on an exposed part of the mid-slopes would be compounded by the prominence of the dwellings so as to produce a significant change in those views. The retained boundary vegetation would continue to soften views of the existing urban form on the west side of Station Road but would do little to screen the visible parts of the new development and this would, therefore, be readily apparent and would be read as a clear extension of the existing built area of the Village.
24. The NKLCA notes that, after the physical slope itself, it is the villages, the countryside between the villages, and the considerable and varied treescape that form the key characteristics of the Lincoln Cliff scarp. The proposal would not affect the existing varied treescape on the mid and higher slopes but would alter the balance of built form and countryside and, when seen from the south west and west, would have a significant adverse effect on one of the key characteristics of the Cliff LCA and on the landscape setting of Waddington Village.
25. Views of the site from Station Road are largely screened by its boundary vegetation although glimpsed views through gaps in this vegetation give a sense of the open nature of the site. This can also be appreciated in the view available through the field gate although the opportunity for a longer distance view from that vantage point is curtailed by the hedging and trees on the site's southern boundary. Most of the vegetation to the front boundary would be retained in the appeal scheme and the contribution which it currently makes to landscape character as experienced along Station Road would be unchanged. However, the new site access would be wider and more open than the current field gate and would allow direct views into the development.
26. I accept that the visual impact would soften as the proposed new planting becomes established but that would take some years and, in the intervening period, the presence and form of the development would be readily apparent to those passing the site. Hence, although the site's green frontage would be preserved, any sense of there being an area of open land behind this would be lost. There would therefore be some, albeit more limited, harm to local landscape character in this regard. The development would also be visible from the upper floors of two dwellings on the opposite side of the road but as this change in view would be seen only by the occupants of those properties this would not represent a significant adverse effect.

27. The main body of Waddington Village lies to the east of Hill Top with the open aspect and long distance views available from that vantage point helping to give a strong sense that this road forms the edge of the village. There are very few properties on the south/west side of Station Road and, with one exception, these are not visually prominent. As one descends the hill from the village, that sense of being at the edge of the settlement is reinforced by the long distance views straight ahead and to the west, with the latter being seen above and between the bungalows that are sited below the road level. The dense vegetation to the site's frontage blocks those views as one passes it but this is a temporary interruption as they open out again on reaching the access to the former nursery. Due to its location and the limited views which enable an appreciation of its being an area of open grazing land, the site does, in my view, play some part in maintaining the sense of a physical and visual gap between Waddington and Waddington Low Fields, notwithstanding its enclosure by vegetation and the continuous ribbon of development on the north east side of Station Road.
28. I accept that the appeal site is different, in terms of its location and setting, to the site to the rear of 87 Station Road where a proposal for 6 dwellings was dismissed on appeal in June 2016 (Ref: APP/ R2520/W/16/3145349); in particular it does not directly adjoin and visually relate to a large expanse of open land as that site does. However, the proposal would have an urbanising effect on this mainly undeveloped edge of the village that would be readily perceived through the available views from Station Road; its contribution to maintaining the gap between the settlements would be diminished as result. The proposal would not lead to the coalescence of the two settlements but I consider that the proposal would inevitably lead to some erosion of the separate identity of Waddington Village.
29. I have been referred to an appeal in relation to 2 dwellings proposed on land at Somerton Gate Farm (APP/R2520/W/15/3134994) which was dismissed in February 2016. Like the current appeal site, the Somerton Gate Farm site adjoins only a very small number of existing properties to the west of Hill Top and lies on a clear edge of the existing village. Although the circumstances are different, that Inspector's concerns about the extension of built development along Somerton Gate Lane at a point where there is a clear transition between the village and its landscape setting support my own findings about the effect of the development proposed in Appeal A.
30. I therefore find the Appeal A proposal would result in harm to the landscape character of the site and its immediate surroundings and in significant harm to the character of the LCLCA and the landscape setting of the village. It would conflict with saved NKLP Policy LW1 which seeks to preserve the distinctive landscapes of the landscape character areas and that development proposals should be well integrated into the local landscape context. It would also be contrary to CLLP Policy LP17 which requires that proposals should have particular regard to maintaining and responding positively to any natural features within the landscape and states that the considerations within the policy are particularly important when they have the potential to impact on the proposed AGLV. Although the CLLP policies can be given limited weight at this stage the conflict with these emerging policies is a material consideration.
31. I also find that, by failing to preserve the individual identity of Waddington Village, the proposal would be contrary to the provisions of CLLP Policy LP22.

However, in light of the appellant's objection to the inclusion of the site within the Green Wedge proposed under that plan that policy can be given very limited weight.

Appeals B and C

32. The dwellings proposed in Appeals B and C would be located on steeply sloping ground on the upper slopes of Lincoln Cliff, adjacent to the historic core of Waddington Village. Due to their location close to the ridge line and the local topography the two sites are partially exposed and stand above most of the properties in the ribbon of development on the north east side of Station Road. Although they adjoin existing built development both sites currently comprise green spaces within the landscape of the upper slopes, with the Appeal C site being read as part of a larger expanse of pasture land extending up to the ridge.
33. Neither of the proposed dwellings would rise above the ridge of the Cliff and their overall height would be reduced by means of their being cut into the steeply sloping ground. However, the LVIA acknowledges the potential for them to be conspicuous in longer distance views from within the vale and the appellant's visualisations show that they would form quite prominent, urban additions in what are currently open green spaces in medium distance views. In Landscape Views 01 and 02 the Appeal B dwelling (Plot A) would sit within the context of existing built form and its effect on the landscape would be reduced as a result. The Appeal C proposal (Plot B) on the higher ground would, however, read as a western extension of that existing built development and would result in harm to the landscape character of the LCLCA and the landscape setting of Waddington Village.
34. Many of the potential short distance views are screened by existing buildings and vegetation but the steeply sloping nature of the site would increase the prominence of the proposed buildings in the available views. I agree that the site of the dwelling proposed in Appeal B currently reads as part of the lawn and garden to number 14 Station Road and is seen against the backdrop of the roofs of other dwellings on the higher ground to the south. The visualisation from View 05 show that this dwelling would be prominent in view when climbing the hill and, although it would be of a similar maximum height to No 14, its siting so far forward of the established building line would make it appear taller and give it added prominence. Where the other properties along this section of the road are generally viewed at an oblique angle behind frontage landscaping the appeal proposal would present the full width of this principal elevation to the viewer.
35. This main façade of about 8 metres (m) in height with its modern design and extensive glazing would stand out as a dominant feature at a point where the existing character of the area is mainly defined by the frontage vegetation to the houses, the heavily vegetated bank that supports Far Lane on its descent to join Station Road, and the mature trees on the higher ground behind the site. Although there would be no loss of this existing vegetation, the siting and scale of the proposal would introduce a strong urban form which would intrude into that existing landscape character. By interrupting the current the views of the rooftops behind the site it would also have some, albeit limited, effect on the viewer's appreciation of the location of the historic core of the village at the top of the hill.

36. The views from Far Lane experienced by residents and other road users are also shared by walkers following the Viking Way as they pass from the centre of the village to the point at which the route turns north to climb to the top of the Lincoln Cliff. For some distance before the site access, viewers approaching from the east have a clear view across the broad expanse of the vale below. On descending the hill towards the sharp bend the views become framed by stone boundary walls to either side but the vale can still be seen over the hawthorn hedge to the site boundary; as Viewpoint 04 shows the extent to which those views are filtered by the trees within the site is significantly reduced in winter months. These views are dramatic and provide the viewer a good appreciation of the scale of the Cliff and the expanse of the vale below. I agree with the LVIA's assessment that those experiencing them are likely to place a high value on those views and consider that is likely to be true of local people who use Far Lane on a regular basis and of walkers who may be experiencing this impressive vista for the first time.
37. The dwelling proposed in Appeal B would be cut into the ground slope and would present a single storey elevation towards the site access on Far Lane. However the LVIA acknowledges the potential for the building to be visible over the boundary hedge and walls from Viewpoint 04, both from the date of completion and at Year 10 when the proposed additional landscaping has become established. I agree that this is likely and consider that the building would probably be even more visible from the more elevated positions further back up the hill. Albeit that only part of the proposed development would be seen from this angle, it would represent a significant intrusion into a landscape view which is currently free from built form and would be experienced by viewers for some time as they walk or drive down the hill towards the bend.
38. The angle of the available view would mean that the dwelling proposed in Appeal B would not be seen through the site access as one approaches the site down the hill. However, given the views that they will have experienced on their descent of Far Lane it seems likely that many walkers following the Viking Way will pause at the existing field gate in the expectation that this vantage will provide an even better view of the slopes of the Cliff and the vale. At present, they would be rewarded by doing so but the long distance views from the gate would largely be lost as a result of Appeal B proposal.
39. When approaching on Far Lane from Station Road, views through the gate are more restricted but do still provide an appreciation of the broad expanse of the Vale and these views would also be curtailed by the proposed development. Notwithstanding that the site is enclosed by a boundary hedge, I agree with the Council that this section of Far Lane serves as an important viewpoint both for local people and users of the Viking Way and I find that the Appeal B proposal would cause significant harm to the landscape character of the LCLCA as perceived from this location.
40. The dwelling proposed in Appeal C would be hidden in views from Far Lane and the enclosure of Viking Way by hedging as it passes the site means that it would not be visible to walkers using this section of the route. The dwelling would have its principal façade facing south west and would stand at a much greater elevation than the houses on Station Road; hence that 2 storey elevation would appear higher and more dominant when viewed from those properties. Views from the rear windows of the nearby houses would be oblique but wider and more open views of the upper slopes and the ridge are

available from the rear gardens and I consider that the proposed dwelling would represent a significant intrusion into those views. I therefore find that harm would be caused both in terms of the proposal's visual impact and its effect on the landscape character as perceived from these properties.

41. The long and densely vegetated bank below Far Lane provides a clear break in frontage development on the east/ north east side of Station Road between the village and the ribbon of development starting at number 14. That frontage would be unchanged and, as the Appeal B site currently reads as part of the garden to No 14, its development would not have any adverse effect in terms of closing an actual or perceived gap between the village and other built areas on this frontage. When viewed from Far Lane there is a stronger perception that the Appeal A and B sites form part of the gap between the village and Waddington Low Fields. By closing that gap the appeal proposals would lead to some erosion of the separate identity of the village in this location.
42. For these reasons I find the development proposed in Appeals A and B would cause harm to the landscape character of the sites and their immediate surroundings and in significant harm to the character of the LCLCA. The proposals would conflict with saved NKLP Policy LW1 and CLLP Policy LP17. Although the CLLP policies can be given limited weight at this stage the conflict with these emerging proposals is a material consideration in the appeals.
43. In failing to preserve the individual identity of Waddington Village, the proposals would also be contrary to CLLP Policy LP22 but, in light of the appellant's objection to the inclusion of the sites within the proposed Green that policy can be given very limited weight.

Other Matters

44. The preferred route for the Lincoln Southern Bypass would cross the vale and climb the Lincoln Cliff to the north of the appeal site, involving the clearance of some of the houses within the existing ribbon development and the downgrading of part of Station Road as a through route. If it were go ahead on that preferred line it could have a significant effect on the landscape character of the LCLCA and may introduce a more clearly defined gap between Waddington Village and Waddington Low Fields. However, as the proposal has yet to be submitted for and to be granted planning permission, I am not able to afford it significant weight in my consideration of the appeal.
45. The appellant has also referred me to a current outline application for 42 dwellings on what I understand to be Council owned land to the rear of 123 Station Road. I agree that that proposal might give rise to concerns as to its landscape effects although its location and surroundings are quite different to those of the sites which are subject to the current appeals. However, as that application has yet to be determined, it does not create any precedent as to how these matters should be assessed in respect of the current appeal proposals.
46. The occupier of No 22 Station Road has objected on the grounds that the dwellings proposed in Appeals B and C would result in a loss of privacy to that property. I agree with the Council that the separation distances between the proposed dwellings and that property would minimise the risk of any loss of privacy to rear living or bedrooms and or overlooking of the garden area. However, due to the scale, orientation and elevated siting of the dwelling

proposed in Appeal C, I consider that it would appear as a dominant and slightly overbearing structure when seen from the rear garden of that property and its immediate neighbours. Some harm would, therefore, be caused to the living conditions of the occupiers of those properties in terms of their outlook. This may not be a reason for refusal of permission on its own but does further call into question the acceptability of the Appeal C proposal.

47. The proposed access to the Appeal B and C sites immediately adjoins the boundary of the Waddington Conservation Area before it crosses Station Road. No harm to the conservation area or its setting has been alleged in the reasons for refusal of any of the appeal proposals and I do not take a different view. Although there would be harm to the landscape setting of Waddington village I would categorise this as landscape harm rather than harm to the setting of the conservation area and, as the character of the conservation area is largely derived from the buildings and narrow streets in the historic core of the village, I do not consider that any harm would be caused to its significance as a designated heritage asset.

Planning Balance

Appeal A

48. The proposal would cause significant harm to the character of the LCLCA and the landscape setting of Waddington Village and harm in terms of the erosion of the distinct identity of the village. It would bring social benefits through the provision of 15 new houses, including 5 affordable homes, and economic benefits through the construction investment and employment, New Homes Bonus, and expenditure on goods and services by the future occupiers of the proposed houses. In the absence of a 5 year HLS and in light of the need to significantly boost the supply of housing these benefits should be given considerable weight. However, I consider that the adverse impacts of granting planning permission would significantly and demonstrably outweigh those benefits. I therefore find that the proposal would not constitute sustainable development having regard to the provisions of paragraph 14 of the Framework and should not be granted planning permission.

Appeals B and C

49. The proposals would result in significant harm to the character of the LCLCA and in more localised harm to landscape character, visual amenity and the outlook of nearby residential properties. Because of their smaller scale the potential economic and social benefits of the proposals would also be much smaller and I find that the adverse impacts of granting planning permission would significantly and demonstrably outweigh those benefits. The proposals would not constitute sustainable development having regard to the provisions of paragraph 14 and should not be granted planning permission.

Conclusions

50. For these reasons I conclude that all 3 appeals should be dismissed.

Paul Singleton

INSPECTOR