
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 February 2021

by C Dillon BA (Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 09 March 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/Y2003/W/20/3263680

**Land adjacent to Chestnut House Farm, Washinghall Lane, Eastoft
DN17 4PR**

- 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 Castelluccio against the decision of North Lincolnshire Council.
 - The application Ref PA/2020/1026, dated 12 July 2020, was refused by notice dated 7 September 2020.
 - The development proposed is outline erection of a detached dwelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The planning application was made in outline with all matters reserved for future consideration. An indicative layout plan was submitted and has been regarded as such for the purposes of this appeal.
3. Since the appeal was lodged the national Housing Delivery Test results have been published and I have considered main parties views on these. It is evident that these results do not influence how this appeal should be examination.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the suitability of the site for housing purposes, with particular regard to the effect on the character and appearance of the countryside.

Reasons

5. The paddock area subject to this appeal site has existing mature planting around the side and rear boundaries. A scattering of buildings around the nearby settlement of Eastoft principally associated with existing rural land-based activities was evident, as was a series of wind turbines in the distance. However, overall, the site's wider context is an exposed, extensive swathe of flat agricultural land.
6. The appeal site is situated beyond the defined built-up area of Eastoft and forms part of the countryside. However, it is located next to a grouping of 2 existing dwellings served off a narrow lane which leads directly to this settlement. Therefore, despite its countryside location, the appeal proposal would not constitute the provision of an isolated dwelling for the purposes of

Paragraph 79 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework). Nonetheless, this in itself does not necessarily justify the appeal proposal.

7. Paragraphs 124 and 130 of the Framework state the importance of good design and improving the character and quality of an area. Paragraph 170 of the Framework states that decisions should contribute to and enhance the local environment by recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside.
8. Although only a short distance from Eastoft, the appeal proposal would not comprise part of the built-up form of the settlement nor would it positively contribute to the historic sporadic pattern of development in the surrounding area.
9. The existing vegetation would lessen the visual presence of the appeal proposal within the otherwise exposed landscape context. Nonetheless, even with further planting, the appeal proposal would be visible from both close up and long distance vantage points, including along Washinghall Lane and upon approach to Eastoft in either direction along the A161.
10. From these vantage points the presence of the appeal proposal would be very apparent, particularly during the autumn and winter months and it would be read as a domestic property within the wider open countryside setting. The domestic paraphernalia that would be reasonably required by a dwelling on this site would contribute to eroding the predominantly undeveloped countryside character of the area.
11. Moreover, the potential to secure the complete screening of the appeal proposal would unduly compromise the otherwise extensive exposed open countryside character of the area.
12. Consequently, by virtue of its location, the appeal proposal would unduly domesticate the countryside and erode the important character of the area.
13. For these reasons, the site would not be suitable for housing purposes, with particular regard to the harm that would be imposed on the character and appearance of the countryside. That harm would be significant.
14. The development plan for the area seeks to safeguard the character and appearance of the countryside. Policy CS5 of the North Lincolnshire Core Strategy (the Core Strategy) states that new development should be appropriate to its context and should contribute to creating a sense of place. In view of the harm that I have identified, the appeal proposal would conflict with this policy.
15. Furthermore, Policy CS1 of the Core Strategy states that support will be given to development that promotes rural economic diversification and small scale employment opportunities, particularly on previously developed land or in existing rural buildings. Policies CS2 and CS3 of the Core Strategy state that any development that takes place outside the defined development limits in the countryside will be restricted. Only development which is essential to the functioning of the countryside will be allowed to take place. Saved Policy RD2 of the North Lincolnshire Local Plan (the Local Plan) echoes this policy approach.

16. No evidence has been submitted that would demonstrate that the appeal proposal would relate to one of the circumstances permitted by these policies. Consequently, the appeal proposal would conflict with all of these development plan policies.

Other Matters

17. The appeal site is within a relatively short walking distance to Eastoft via Washinghall Lane. This lane has no footway or lighting to serve pedestrian movements that would be generated from the site. Moreover, the submitted evidence does not adequately demonstrate that employment, services and facilities required for day to day subsistence could be easily reached by sustainable forms of travel on a regular basis. Consequently, the accessibility credentials of the site advanced by the appellant would attract limited weight in favour of the appeal proposal.
18. The contribution to sustaining existing local services would attract limited weight in favour of the appeal proposal given the scheme relates to only one dwelling. For the same reasons, the contribution of the appeal proposal to the local economy would also attract limited weight in favour of the appeal proposal.
19. The small contribution that the appeal proposal would make to housing land supply and delivery would attract limited weight given and housing land supply position and the results of the recent Housing Delivery Test.
20. The submitted evidence does not substantiate the level benefits to biodiversity that have been advanced and therefore any such potential would attract only limited weight in favour of the appeal proposal. There is insufficient certainty that a planning condition to secure these measures would serve to justify an increase in the level of weight that I could attach to this matter.
21. Although it is possible that the appeal proposal could employ sustainable methods of construction, the details of these are not before me and therefore such potential would attract only limited weight in favour of the appeal proposal. There is insufficient certainty that a planning condition to secure these measures would serve to justify an increase in the level of weight that I could attach to this matter.

Conclusion

22. The appeal proposal would give rise to significant harm to the character and appearance of the countryside and this would conflict with the development plan. The matters before me that would weigh in favour of the appeal proposal would not out-weigh the identified conflict with the development plan when taken as a whole.
23. For the reasons given, the appeal should be dismissed.

C Dillon

INSPECTOR