



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 December 2020

by Graeme Robbie BA(Hons) BPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 8 January 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/V0728/W/20/3258412

land at Charltonsfield, High Street, Moorsholm TS12 3JP

Easting(x): 468811 Northing(y): 513851

- 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 M Wood against the decision of Redcar & Cleveland Borough Council.
 - The application Ref R/2019/0702/FF, dated 11 November 2020, was refused by notice dated 8 July 2020.
 - The development proposed is a proposed dwelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is whether or not the appeal site is an appropriate location for residential development, having regard to the development plan and national planning policy.

Reasons

3. Moorsholm is a long village with, the most part, a clear linear pattern of development along much of its length, punctuated by clusters of development that introduce a limited degree of depth. Beyond Moorsholm's designated settlement limit, the prevailing pattern of development breaks down somewhat. The clusters of housing become more sporadic to the south of the village, lacking the linear frontage housing that provides a visual and contextual link within the village itself.
4. Whilst perhaps considered locally and colloquially as being within 'Moorsholm', the appeal site and the small cluster of houses around it are physically and visually detached from the village itself, surrounded on all side by open fields and separated from the next nearest cluster of houses by fields. There is no dispute that the appeal site lies beyond the designated development and it is therefore, in development plan terms, located in the open countryside.
5. It is not, however, an isolated location. A short terrace of houses lies on the opposite side of the narrow lane to the appeal site, with a similarly short row of houses fronting the main road. A footpath runs along the western side of the main road providing a continuous illuminated pavement link to the village itself which, whilst having only limited services and facilities, is nevertheless identified by Redcar and Cleveland Local Plan (LP) policy SD2 as being able to

accommodate limited development of an appropriate scale. This is however predicated on development being within the village development limits. That would not be the case in this instance and the proposal would therefore be contrary to LP policy SD2.

6. LP policy SD3 considers development beyond the development limits and sets out a range of forms of development considered to be appropriate in such locations. The appellant claims the land to be previously developed and which, prior to being tidied up, hosted a range of dilapidated buildings. The buildings shown in the appellant's photographs¹ were not however present at the time of my visit and the site appeared to be reasonably tidy and well maintained.
7. Nevertheless, there were small stable buildings present on the site's frontage which the proposal shows would be retained. However, whilst these are included within the wider appeal site area, the appeal site appeared to be comprised of at least two distinct parcels of land. Although the appellant claims the site is previously developed land, I am not persuaded that it has been adequately demonstrated that the site satisfies the Framework definition of such. Whilst the Council have not elaborated on the reasons for their blanket dismissal of the forms of development set out in LP policy SD3 (a) to (j), nor has the appellant clearly or compellingly demonstrated that the proposal benefits from these exemptions, with particular regard to LP policy SD3(j), as a form of appropriate development beyond designated development limits. As such, the proposal is contrary to LP policies SD1, SD2 and SD3 which seek to direct development to appropriate locations and encourage sustainable patterns of development.

Other Matters

8. The development of an additional dwelling house would contribute to housing supply within the borough. With occupation of that property would come contributions in economic and social terms to the local community. However, these benefits would be limited in their extent and would not outweigh the harm arising from development within the open countryside.
9. It is also noted that the Council do not object to the proposal in terms of its design, appearance, construction materials and massing, height, size and scale. Nor do the Council express concerns regarding living conditions in terms of privacy or outlook, either of existing residents of nearby properties or of future occupiers of the proposed dwelling, access and highway safety or matters of drainage. These are, however, neutral effects and weigh neither in support of, nor against, the proposal.
10. I have noted that the proposed dwelling would provide a home for the appellant's daughter and family and would offer security over their horses and equipment. Whilst I can appreciate the appellant's desire to provide a home for family members this reason does not persuade me to find the scheme acceptable. Nor have I been presented with any evidence of security concerns that would lead me to find the scheme acceptable.

¹ Appellant's Statement of Case

Conclusion

11. For the reasons set out above, and having considered all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Graeme Robbie

INSPECTOR