



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 August 2019

by Jonathan Edwards BSc(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27 August 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/H2835/W/19/3229192

Annexe, 75 Easton Lane, Bozeat, Wellingborough NN29 7NN

- 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 Anthony Burke against the decision of Borough Council of Wellingborough.
 - The application Ref WP/18/00554/FUL, dated 19 August 2018, was refused by notice dated 21 November 2018.
 - The development proposed is the demolition of a workshop/storage barn and extension of residential dwelling to create main dwelling and residential 'granny' annex.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The description of the proposed development in the heading above is taken from the application form. The Council's decision notice includes a different description although I have not been provided with written confirmation that this has been agreed. Accordingly, I have used the original description.
3. Since the Council's decision, the Plan for the Borough of Wellingborough 2019 (PBW) has been adopted. Accordingly, I have given it full weight in my decision. Also, the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) was revised on 19 February 2019 and this post-dates the Council's refusal notice. I have considered the Framework as part of the determination of this appeal.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is whether the site is a suitable location for the proposed development having regard to the policies of the development plan.

Reasons

5. The appeal site lies outside and does not adjoin the Bozeat village boundary as shown on the PBW Policies Map. Under PBW policy SS1, this boundary defines whether sites are in or adjoin the village in applying policies 11 and 13 of the adopted North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy 2016 (NNJCS).
6. Policy 11 sets out the NNJCS spatial strategy and generally resists development in the open countryside unless allowed under policy 13 or national policy. Part 1 of policy 13 is not applicable in the assessment of the proposal as the appeal site does not adjoin the village boundary. Part 2 of policy 13 resists new built residential development away from established settlements except for

dwelling of exceptional quality or for rural workers. The appeal proposal would not be a rural workers' dwelling and whilst of a contemporary design there is limited evidence to show it would be truly innovative or of exceptional quality. As such, the proposal would be contrary to NNJCS policy 13.

7. Policy H6 of the PBW supports single plot affordable exception sites for self-build dwellings in rural areas subject to compliance with various criteria. As it would be contrary to NNJCS policy 13, the proposal would fail to meet a policy H6 requirement. Furthermore, there is no planning obligation that would ensure the proposed dwelling remains as an affordable property, and so the proposal would not comply with PBW policy H6 in this respect.
8. The appeal site is not remote from Bozeat and so would not be in an isolated location in terms of the provisions of the Framework. Even if the proposed dwelling was deemed to represent an isolated home, the proposal would not comply with any of the circumstances set out under paragraph 79 of the Framework and therefore would not be permissible under national policy.
9. Consequently, I conclude the appeal site would not represent a suitable location for the proposed development having regard to the policies of the development plan as outlined above.

Other matters

10. The proposed building would not cause visual intrusion nor harm the character and appearance of the area. It would include energy and water efficiency measures and whilst not of exceptional quality, the proposal would be acceptable in design terms. The proposed house would be within a reasonable walking distance to facilities and public transport links in Bozeat so residents would not be solely reliant on private car usage. Whilst acknowledging these points, the lack of harm in these respects is a neutral impact that do not weigh in favour of the development
11. Regardless as to whether the appeal site could be defined as previously developed land, the Framework¹ emphasises the value of using brownfield land specifically in settlements rather than in the countryside. As such, I attach only limited positive weight to this issue in my assessment of the appeal.
12. I have carefully considered the personal circumstance reasons why the appellant has applied for planning permission for the proposed development. On the evidence before me, I have no doubt the proposal would be of benefit to the appellant and his family in meeting their specific accommodation requirements. However, the evidence is unclear on why these needs could not be met through reasonable alternatives to the appeal proposal. For example, York Cottage is a sizeable property set in large grounds and the submitted evidence is unconvincing on why it could not be adapted or extended to meet the appellant's accommodation requirements. Consequently, whilst sympathetic to the appellant's position, I attach only modest weight to the personal circumstances in my consideration of the appeal.
13. I have not been provided with the background leading to the appeal decision² referred to me, but I note this relates to a proposed development in a location with different development plan policies. Also, the decision was issued prior to

¹ At Paragraph 118(c)

² Appeal Ref No: APP/L3245/W/16/3150307

the publication of the latest version of the Framework. As such, this appeal decision is of limited relevance and I have considered the current appeal on its own merits against the latest Framework and the specific local development plan policies relevant to this proposal.

14. Occupiers of the proposed dwelling are likely to use and support local services and the proposal would contribute to the supply of housing as well as generate employment during its construction. However, any benefits of the scheme in these regards would be modest given the scale of the proposed development.
15. In addition to the above, I have noted the other points made by the appellant in support of the appeal scheme. However, these do not either singly or in combination, lead me away from my overall conclusion.
16. Overall, the benefits of the proposal are modest and insufficient to justify allowing the appeal contrary to the provisions of the local development plan policies.

Conclusion

17. For the reasons given above, and taking into account all other matters raised, I conclude the appeal should be dismissed.

Jonathan Edwards

INSPECTOR