



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 November 2023

by Paul Cooper MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 1st December 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/Y2003/W/23/3319315

Pumping Station, Carr Lane, East Lound, North Lincolnshire DN9 2LT

- 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 Oades against the decision of North Lincolnshire Council.
 - The application Ref PA/2022/1557, dated 25 August 2022, was refused by notice dated 12 January 2023.
 - The development proposed is infill field / plot to be changed into a residential building plot complete with detached house.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues in this appeal are :-
 - The location of the proposed development.
 - The effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the Isle of Axholme Area of Special Landscape Interest.

Reasons

Location

3. Policy CS8 of the North Lincolnshire Local Development Framework Core Strategy (2011) (the CS) sets out the spatial distribution of housing sites, Policy CS3 sets out the purposes of development limits and CS2 details a sequential approach to development seeking to focus development within development limits. The appeal site is outside the development limits for East Lound. Therefore, for planning purposes it is within the countryside. Policy RD2 of the North Lincolnshire Local Plan (2003) (The LP) states that development in open countryside will be strictly controlled with certain exceptions.
4. The development plan policies are broadly consistent with the aims of the Framework which state that housing should be located where it will enhance and maintain the vitality of rural communities. Planning policies should identify opportunities for villages to grow and thrive, especially where this will support local services.
5. East Lound is a small hamlet with limited services and facilities. The appeal site is located in an area where it is likely that the majority of trips to access services and facilities would be by car.

6. The evidence before me does not demonstrate that the proposal, on its own merits, would be a suitable location for a dwelling having regard to national and local planning policies and proximity to services and facilities. Therefore, the proposal would conflict with Policies CS2, CS3 and CS8 of the Core Strategy and Policy RD2 of the Local Plan. It would also conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework).

Effect on Area of Special Landscape Interest

7. East Lound is located to the east of Haxey. It is located within the area of the Isle of Axholme Special Landscape Interest, which is locally designated for its unique historic landscape retaining the pattern of ancient open strip fields and early enclosed fields that surround the villages on the Isle. It is a non-designated heritage asset.
8. Development on Carr Lane itself becomes progressively sporadic when leaving the village, and the highway narrows, with some open views, whilst grass verges, hedging and mature trees line the road. This open, rural landscape forms part of the area of significance of the Isle of Axholme designation.
9. The proposed dwelling would be located away from the main developed part of Carr Lane, in an area where development begins to minimise as Carr Lane runs to the south. The dwelling would be a significant feature in the landscape, visible from Carr Lane, and both entering and exiting the village. In addition, the access and parking arrangements, plus the general domestic paraphernalia that is associated with residential development would further accentuate the domestic nature of the proposal and not be in keeping with the designation of the area.
10. I have taken into consideration the supporting heritage statement submitted with the application but find that the reasoning sought to justify the proposal does not fully take into consideration the impact that the development would have on the overall designation as a whole.
11. I recognise that the appeal site forms a small parcel of the overall designation, and there have been some recent development that has, to a certain extent, altered some of the character of the Special Landscape Interest element. Nonetheless, the proposal would be at odds with the designation and not accord with the character of the area.
12. For the reasons indicated, I consider that the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the Isle of Axholme Area of Special Landscape Interest and would conflict with Policy CS6 of the CS and Policies LC7, LC14 and RD2 of the LP which seek to ensure that development does not destroy, damage or adversely affect the character, appearance or setting of the historic landscape and more generally ensure that development enhances the local character and distinctiveness of the area in which it would be situated.
13. In addition, Paragraph 197 of the Framework requires that a balanced judgement should be taken of the effect of a development on a non-designated heritage asset, having regard to the scale of any harm and its significance. For the reasons given above, I consider that the proposal would harm the significance of the landscape. In addition, the proposal would conflict with the Framework where it seeks to protect and enhance valued landscapes and recognise the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside.

Other Matters

14. I have taken into consideration the appellants comments with regard to approvals that are similar to this proposal, and the inconsistency of the Council's decision making. Whilst these development have been pointed out to me in the appellants statement, I have no further details of the works in order to understand the reasoning behind them and these examples do not justify a planning permission and, in any event, each case should be considered on its own merits.

Conclusion

15. For the reasons set out above, having regard to the development plan as a whole and all other relevant material considerations, including the Framework, the appeal is dismissed.

Paul Cooper

INSPECTOR