



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 March 2022

by Zoe Raygen DipURP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 8 April 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/D2510/W/21/3286182

Side Farm, Bucknall Road, Horsington LN10 5ET

- 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 P Woolley against the decision of East Lindsey District Council.
 - The application Ref S/087/01381/21, dated 22 June 2021, was refused by notice dated 19 August 2021.
 - The development proposed is a new dwelling with detached garage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is whether or not the appeal site is an appropriate location for a house having particular regard to accessibility.

Reasons

3. The development strategy for the District outlines a hierarchical approach to the distribution of development to ensure that it is in the most accessible locations guiding new growth based on the capacity to provide and sustain a pattern of viable communities. The settlement pattern places settlements in the District into different categories based on the range of services, facilities and employment available to them.
4. Policy SP1 of the East Lindsey Local Plan Core Strategy 2018 (the Local Plan) allocates Horsington as a Small Village, which are described as having a limited range of services or facilities. The limited facilities means that most look to higher order settlements to meet the vast majority of their needs. As the majority do not have access to public transport in the form of scheduled bus services, they are not considered suitable for major housing or employment growth.
5. Policy SP4 of the Local Plan supports the provision of housing in an appropriate location within the developed footprint of a Small Village as infill, frontage development of no more than 2 dwellings. The developed footprint is defined as the continuous built form of the settlement and excludes individual groups of dispersed buildings which are detached from the continuous built up area of the settlement.
6. The appeal site sits within a small cluster of dwellings approximately 600m from the main built up area of Horsington. In this regard therefore the proposal

is contrary to policy SP4 as the appeal site is not within the developed footprint of the village.

7. The appellant considers the appeal site to be previously developed land. This is not contested by the Council and, from my observations on site and the evidence before me regarding the presence of a stable/store, since demolished, I would concur. Policy SP4 supports the redevelopment of previously developed land within Small Villages subject to various criteria.
8. While there are no buildings suitable for conversion, and the proposed house would be confined to the brownfield site, there is no evidence before me that the site has been actively marketed for a community, economic or leisure use. I note the comments of the appellant regarding the suitability of such uses in this location. However, this has not been tested by a marketing exercise and without that the policy requirements are not met, whether or not the appeal site is considered to be within the village as required by the Policy.
9. I saw at my site visit that the level of facilities available in Horsington is low, including a church, village hall and a pub. As such residents are likely to rely on larger settlements for their everyday needs. The appellant has provided the most up to date details of bus services which link Horsington to Lincoln, Bardney and Horncastle all of which have a much wider range of services and facilities. However, the bus service is limited through the day and does not operate on a Sunday. Furthermore, the bus stop is about a 15 minute walk from the appeal site along a very narrow unlit footway. While this might be a pleasant walk in the summer months, it would not be as convenient in the darker, winter months particularly first thing in the morning or in the evening if commuting for employment opportunities. This leads me to conclude that future residents would more likely make use of the car and, consequently, the appeal site does not offer a genuine choice of transport modes as required by paragraph 105 of the National Planning Policy Framework.
10. Residents of a new house built within the developed footprint of Horsington would have access to the same limited services but would be located nearer to the bus stop making it more convenient for their use.
11. I am aware that there has been an increase in the use of the internet for shopping and doctors' appointments due to the Covid pandemic. However, there is no convincing evidence before me to suggest that this trend will continue. In addition, journeys would also be required for educational purposes and some employment opportunities.
12. Given that the appeal site is located amongst a small cluster of dwellings it would not be isolated as considered by paragraph 80 of the National Planning Policy Framework. Furthermore, I note that paragraph 79 of the Framework supports the provision of development in one village where it may support services in a village nearby where there are groups of smaller settlements. Moreover, I acknowledge that given the rural nature of the area dependence on the car may already be high, and the provision of one house would result in a small number of car journeys, which may be short if travelling to nearby Woodhall Spa for essential services.
13. Nevertheless, the settlement strategy in the development plan is predicated on the reliance of many of the smaller settlements on larger ones for their day to day needs directing development to the most accessible locations and provision

is made for the development of dwellings within Small and Medium villages in Policy SP4, subject to criteria which are not met by this proposal. Allowing a new dwelling here would undermine the locational strategy of the development plan.

14. I have seen nothing to suggest the Council is unable to demonstrate a five year housing land supply. At the present time therefore, the Policies are up to date, and I give conflict with them full weight. To develop the appeal site as proposed would be at odds with, and would undermine public confidence in, the plan led system. I am mindful in this regard, that the Framework recognises that the planning system should be genuinely plan led. In my view therefore, this would not be an appropriate site for development having regard to local planning policies that seek to manage the location of new development.
15. For the reasons above I conclude that the appeal site is not an appropriate location for a house having particular regard to accessibility. Consequently, there would be conflict with policies SP1 and SP4 of the Local Plan and the Framework.
16. The Council also refers to Policy SP2 of the Local Plan. However, this is a general decision making policy which is reflected in the conclusion below.

Conclusion

17. I have found conflict with a number of Local Plan policies, including the development strategy envisaged for the District, which brings the proposal into conflict with the development plan as a whole.
18. The provision of a new house would be a benefit. Furthermore, the proposal would offer economic benefits through construction jobs and the contribution of future residents to the local economy. The contribution though would be modest based on the provision of one dwelling. The use of previously developed land is a substantial benefit.
19. There is no doubt that the benefits of this proposal are considerable, and in that respect the proposal would broadly accord with many policies of the Local Plan. However, those benefits, even when taken together, would not be sufficient, in my view, to outweigh the conflict with the development plan. There are no persuasive material considerations in this case to indicate that the proposal should be determined other than in accordance with the development plan.
20. For the reasons set out above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude on balance that the appeal should be dismissed.

Zoe Raygen

INSPECTOR