



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 March 2022

by L Wilson BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 29 March 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/Y2003/W/21/3286866

Land south of Greenfield Farm, 23 West Street, Hibaldstow DN20 9NY

- 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 James Catchpole against the decision of North Lincolnshire Council.
 - The application Ref PA/2019/2082, dated 10 December 2019, was refused by notice dated 17 May 2021.
 - The development was originally described as proposed development of 9 residential dwelling houses with access onto Redbourne Road.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The site address in the heading above has been taken from the Council's decision notice as it is more precise than that given on the application form.
3. This is an outline application with means of access to be considered. Appearance, layout, scale and landscaping are reserved matters for future approval. I will proceed on the basis that details shown on the submitted drawings in respect of matters that are reserved for future approval are for illustrative purposes.

Main Issues

4. The main issues are:
 - Whether the site represents an appropriate location, having regard to the relevant local and national planning policy for the delivery of housing; and
 - The effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

Location

5. The appeal site is situated outside the defined development boundary for Hibaldstow. There is no evidence before me which demonstrates that the development is essential to the functioning of the countryside.
6. Paragraph 105 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) recognises that opportunities to maximise sustainable transport solutions will

vary between urban and rural areas. Within Hibaldstow there are local facilities which would be walkable from the site. However, future occupiers would need to travel to other settlements to meet their day-to-day needs.

7. There are bus stops within walking distance of the appeal site. Nevertheless, based on the information before me, the bus service is limited and would not be a realistic option for future occupiers. Some future occupiers might cycle to other settlements, for example Brigg and Kirton in Lindsey. Having said that, due to the nature of the roads, speed limits and distance involved, it is unlikely that future occupiers would regularly cycle to other settlements.
8. Paragraph 79 of the Framework seeks to promote sustainable development in rural areas and states housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities. The proposed development may, to a degree, support local services and facilities but there is no compelling evidence before me which demonstrates that the proposal would maintain or enhance community vitality.
9. The proposal would be contrary to the development plan, which is the starting point for decision-making. It would undermine the Council's plan-led approach to development which seeks to locate new housing in the most sustainable locations. Even in the context of the rural area in which the site is located, the availability of sustainable transport options is limited and unsuitable in comparison to more sustainable locations. For the reasons given above, the proposed development is likely to result in unsustainable travel patterns and a reliance on the use of a private vehicle to meet future occupiers' day-to-day needs.
10. For these reasons, the site would not represent an appropriate location for the proposed development, having regard to the relevant local and national planning policy for the delivery of housing. Consequently, it would conflict with Policy CS2 of the North Lincolnshire Core Strategy (2011) (CS). This states that developments should be located to minimise the need to travel and to encourage any journeys that remain necessary to be possible by walking, cycling and public transport. It would also conflict with the Framework which seeks to promote sustainable development in rural areas.

Character and appearance

11. The appeal site is located to the edge of Hibaldstow. The site has been used for sheep grazing, and dog agility and exercising. This section of Redbourne Road visually appears undeveloped. Although the site is adjacent to Greenfield Farm, that is not particularly evident from Redbourne Road. To the north of the site is a Co-op store and associated carpark. There would be a gap between the Co-op store and the appeal site. The opposite side of Redbourne Road is more developed and contains residential properties. However, the appeal site has little visual relationship with those buildings due to the intervening highway.
12. Notwithstanding that the proposed development is in outline and the scheme could include an active frontage, it would be seen as separate to nearby residential development and would introduce a significant amount of built development. The proposed development would substantially alter the appeal site's currently undeveloped and open character. This would urbanise the character of the site and this side of Redbourne Road. The proposed

development would poorly integrate with the existing pattern of development and would harm the open countryside.

13. For these reasons, the proposed development would be visually harmful to the character and appearance of the surrounding area. Consequently, it would conflict with Policies CS1, CS2, CS3 and CS5 of the CS and Policies RD2, DS1 and H5 of the North Lincolnshire Local Plan (2003) (LP). These seek, amongst other matters, to ensure development would not be detrimental to the character or appearance of the open countryside. It would also conflict with paragraphs 130 and 174 of the Framework which state developments should be sympathetic to local character and should recognise the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside.

Other matters

14. My attention has been drawn to other approved planning applications. There are some similarities between those applications and the development proposed. However, the site context as well as the scale of the developments and associated benefits cannot be directly compared to the scheme before me. In any event, each application must be considered on its own merits.

Planning balance

15. As set out above, the site would not represent an appropriate location for the proposed development, and it would be visually harmful to the character and appearance of the surrounding area.
16. The proposed development would provide new homes, including for the appellant's family, and would provide social, economic benefits including through construction and support local amenities and services. However, based on the information presented, the benefits associated with the scheme would be limited, given the scale of the development.
17. It has been suggested that paragraph 11(d) of the Framework is engaged because of the Council's housing land supply position and policies are out of date. The most relevant policies are consistent with the aims of the Framework regarding the need to promote sustainable development in rural areas, recognising the intrinsic character of the countryside and developments should be sympathetic to local character. Given the harm I have identified, even if paragraph 11(d) is engaged, the adverse impacts of granting permission would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies of the Framework taken as a whole.

Conclusion

18. For the reasons given above, having considered the development plan as a whole, the approach in the Framework, and all other material considerations, the appeal does not succeed.

L M Wilson

INSPECTOR