



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 November 2017

by S R G Baird BA(Hons) MRTPI

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

Decision date: 30th November 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/M2325/W/17/3184285

12 The Crescent, Naze Lane East, Freckleton, Preston, Lancashire PR4 1UL

- 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 A Pearce against the decision of Fylde Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 17/0271, dated 3 April 2017, was refused by notice dated 12 June 2017.
 - The development proposed is 2 semi-detached bungalows to the rear of an existing property.
-

Preliminary Matter

1. The application was submitted in outline with all matters other than access, layout and scale reserved for a subsequent application.

Decision

2. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

3. These are: (1) whether the location of the proposed dwelling would accord with development plan¹ (DP) policies regarding the location of residential development; (2) the implications for the living conditions of prospective residents with particular reference to noise and disturbance and (3) the implications of the development for protected species.

Reasons

Issue 1

4. For planning policy purposes the appeal site is located within the countryside. Here DP Policy SP2 indicates that development will not be permitted except where it would accord with exceptions set out by the policy. Market housing does not fall within any of these exceptions. DP Policy HL2 indicates that housing will only be permitted where, amongst other things, it would be in a sustainable location having regard to the local availability of shops, schools, employment sources, public transport and other community facilities. Whilst the appeal site is located adjacent to the Naze Lane Industrial Estate, all the other remaining facilities detailed by the policy are located within Freckleton, some 1.5km to the north. The appeal site would be within the 2 km distance suggested by Manual for Streets where walking offers the greatest potential to replace short car trips. However, for a significant distance Naze Lane East is narrow, has poor forward visibility, has no footpaths and is unlit. The area is

¹ Fylde Borough Local Plan – As Altered October 2005.

not served by public transport. These factors would be a significant disincentive to cycling and walking trips and as such I consider the appeal site would not represent a sustainable location. Accordingly, on this issue, I conclude that the proposed development would conflict with DP Policies HL7 (7) and SP2.

5. In coming to the above conclusion, I have had regard to the appellant's reference to a planning permission for a dwelling at Six Acres on the northern edge of this group of dwellings. Other than an assertion that planning permission has been granted, I have not been provided with any other detail regarding this development. As such I am not in a position to consider whether it forms a material consideration in my assessment of the appeal proposal. I have also noted the reference to a proposed allocation within the emerging local plan for 13 houses at High Meadows, Freckleton and an extension to the Naze Lane Industrial Estate. I have no doubt that these allocations have undergone a sustainability appraisal as part of the emerging local plan. However, again I have not been provided with any detail regarding these allocations. The emerging local plan is still the subject of examination and allocations may change. As such and in the absence of any information I can attach only limited weight to these submissions

Issue 2

6. The appeal site forms part of a group of dwellings located adjacent to the Naze Lane Industrial Estate some of which are served by the partly unmade private road. At the time of my visit the area was relatively tranquil and I have no reason to conclude that this was a unique observation. Moreover there is no indication that operations on this estate or the state of the private road have resulted in complaints from existing occupiers particularly, regarding noise and disturbance. In these circumstances, I conclude that proposed location of the new dwellings would not result in unacceptable living conditions for future occupiers contrary to the objectives of DP Policy EMP4.

Issue 3

7. This development would require the removal of a large, single-storey shed clad in profiled steel sheets. In my experience, this type of building is unlikely to be attractive habitat for bats. Moreover, this is a matter that could reasonably be covered by imposing a planning condition.

Conclusion

8. Notwithstanding my conclusions regarding issues 2 and 3, the proposed development would be in conflict with DP Policies SP2 and HL7 resulting in harm. There are no material considerations that would outweigh this fundamental conflict with the location strategy of the development plan. Accordingly, and having taken all other matters into consideration, the appeal is dismissed.

George Baird

Inspector

