



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 November 2022

by L Hughes, BA (Hons), MSc, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 28 November 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/A2525/W/22/3300413

Huntspill Cottage, Roman Bank, Holbeach Bank, Spalding, PE12 8BX

- 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 Paul Reis against the decision of South Holland District Council.
 - The application Ref H09-0135-22, dated 7 February 2022, was refused by notice dated 26 April 2022.
 - The development proposed is a 3 bed detached property.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are:
 - whether the proposed development is in a suitable location for housing, having regard to the local development strategy for the area; and
 - the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

Suitable location

3. The appeal site is located near the edge of the small village of Holbeach Bank and comprises garden land for Huntspill Cottage. The garden lies towards the end of a series of dwellings on this side of Roman Bank, with open fields behind. The proposal is to erect a new dwelling facing onto Roman Bank with its own garden and parking.
4. The site is not within a settlement, as defined by the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan (SELLP) 2011-2036 (2019). Consequently, it is classified as being within the countryside, notwithstanding that the current land use is residential rather than agricultural. Policy 1 of the SELLP identifies that development in the countryside will be permitted that is necessary in such a location, or where it can be demonstrated that it meets the sustainable development needs of the area in terms of economic, community or environmental benefits. No such justification has been provided that this location is necessary for this dwelling.
5. I acknowledge the economic benefit from the dwelling's construction and from potential local employment and spending, but this is only a very minor benefit. I also accept that the proposal would make a more effective use of land in

order to contribute to housing supply targets. However, given that the Council's ability to demonstrate adequate housing land supply is not contested, even if the proposal could be delivered quickly, the net benefit of 1 unit is minimal and therefore this is only a very minor benefit.

6. While a general remoteness may be part of the appeal of living in a rural area, there are very limited services and facilities in Holbeach Bank. Adding residential development here would therefore make the occupiers of the proposed dwelling be reliant on the private car for access to other settlements. Deliveries or home visits for services would still increase traffic movements here overall. Furthermore, although the primary school is within walking distance, my site visit identified that the route is via a road with no pavement. I have no evidence that this is therefore a suitable route for children and families which would encourage walking and minimise vehicle movements. No community or environmental benefits have been suggested which would outweigh this environmental harm.
7. In conclusion therefore, the proposed development would not be in a suitable location for housing, having regard to the local development strategy for the area, as it would be contrary to policy 1 of the SELLP and undermine the spatial strategy by directing growth to the wrong place. It would also conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework ('the Framework') (2021) paragraphs 17 and 105, which also support the development plan to include strategic policies to actively manage patterns of growth to promote sustainable transport.

Character and appearance

8. The size and form of the proposed dwelling would be similar to that of nearby properties, and the materials would also broadly match Huntspill Cottage and the dwelling beyond.
9. Along this stretch of the road there is little uniformity in the siting of the dwellings within their plots, and the associated garden sizes and shapes. While the proposal would fill the present gap and thus to a minor degree consolidate the existing development here, it would not increase the furthest extent of the built form of the village. The garden of Huntspill Cottage is of sufficient size for the proposed dwelling to fit comfortably within the streetscene. It would not be notable within oblique views along Roman Bank due to the backdrop of the existing dwellings on both sides of the road, and similarly in views from the rear it would be set within the wider line of dwellings and vegetation and so would not be incongruous or prominent.
10. In conclusion therefore, the proposed development would not cause harm to the character and appearance of the area. This would comply with the SELLP policy 2 which seeks to mitigate the impact of new development with regard to sustainable considerations, with specific reference to the character and appearance of the area and the relationship to existing development. The proposal would also comply with those aims of paragraphs 124 and 130 of the Framework as regards support for development which maintains and is sympathetic to an area's prevailing character and setting, and which is visually attractive.

Conclusion

11. While there would be no harm to the character and appearance of the area, the proposal would fail to promote travel by non-car modes and would result in development in a location deemed unsuitable by local planning policy. The proposal conflicts with the development plan as a whole. With no other material considerations outweighing this conflict, for the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal is dismissed.

L Hughes

INSPECTOR