



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 April 2025

by **D Ellis MPlan MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 3rd June 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/A2525/W/25/3359058

**Rear of Landmere Cottage, Main Road, Holbeach Drove, Spalding, Lincolnshire
PE12 0PS**

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr A Clues against the decision of South Holland District Council.
 - The application Ref is H09-0580-24.
 - The development proposed is erection of single dwelling & detached garage rear of Landmere Cottage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The description of development on the application form stated that the application was a re-submission of a previous refusal of planning permission. In the interests of conciseness, I have omitted this from the description in the header above as this is not a term of development.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are:
 - whether the site is a suitable location for housing, having regard to the development plan as a whole; and
 - the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

Suitable location for housing

4. The appeal site is a plot of land to the rear of 'Landmere Cottage' which, apart from the access, is situated outside of the settlement boundary. Policy 1 of the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2011-2036 (March 2019) (SELLP) sets out the spatial strategy and states that areas outside of the defined settlement boundaries are designated as countryside.
5. The policy goes on to state that development in the countryside 'will be permitted that is necessary to such a location and/or where it can be demonstrated that it meets the sustainable development needs of the area in terms of economic, community and environmental benefits.' The supporting text of Policy 1 sets out, in paragraph 3.2.17, two example exceptions where housing development may be

justified in the countryside, including to meet the specific housing needs of the settlement.

6. Notwithstanding the existing built-up nature of Main Road, there are very few services in Holbeach Drove and I have no evidence before me to demonstrate that the settlement is well served by public transport. I am therefore not convinced that the site is a sustainable location for new housing with regards to services and public transport links. Furthermore, the Council can demonstrate a 5-year housing land supply and, consequently, the proposed dwelling would not be necessary to meet the specific housing needs of Holbeach Drove. As such, I am not persuaded that the proposed dwelling is necessary in this location or that it meets the sustainable development needs of the area.
7. The appellant states that the proposal would be for a self-build dwelling. However, there is no mechanism before me, such as a signed Section 106 agreement, to secure the new dwelling as a self-build property. Notwithstanding this, paragraph 5.3.5 of the supporting text to SELLP Policy 11 states that there may be opportunities for infill self-build development within defined settlement boundaries, although housing need may also be met through rural exception sites where appropriate. The appeal site is not within a settlement boundary, and it has not been suggested that it would be a rural exception site.
8. I have also been referred to several planning permissions in the Council area for self-build dwellings outside of their respective development boundaries. Some of these are stated to be infill sites, however, even if the appeal site was also considered an infill site, Policy 1 makes no reference to infill sites in the countryside. Moreover, no substantive details of any of these permissions have been provided so I am unable to make a meaningful comparison between these permissions and the appeal scheme before me. Overall, I attach very limited weight to the provision of a self-build property and its respective benefits.
9. On the basis of the above, there is no compelling reason before me to justify a deviation from the provisions of Policy 1 in this case. Accordingly, the proposed site would not represent a suitable location for housing, having regard to the development plan as a whole. The proposal would therefore conflict with SELLP Policy 1 which seeks, among other matters, to direct new development to the most sustainable locations.

Character and appearance

10. The properties along the southern side of Main Road largely follow a linear pattern of development, although 'Lambeth House' is situated to the rear of the appeal site and 'Willow Lodge', 'Sunnyside' and 'Chez Nous'. To the rear of the properties on the northern side of Main Road are the properties in St Polycarp's Drive. These examples contribute to the current character and appearance of Main Road, which is no longer a wholly linear pattern of development.
11. Whilst the proposed two-storey dwelling would have a modern appearance, the surrounding properties have a range of designs, sizes, and are finished with materials including render and brick. Furthermore, the proposed dwelling would be most visible from Long Lane and, despite the modest difference in height and size, would be seen between and in the context of the two-storey dwellings of 'Landmere Cottage' and 'Lambeth House'. Overall, the proposed dwelling would not appear out of place and would be appropriate to its location and surroundings.

12. Consequently, the proposal would not cause harm to the character and appearance of the area. It would comply with SELLP Policies 2 and 3, insofar as they require development proposals to respect the scale and massing of neighbouring properties and the surrounding area, and to relate to existing development and the character and appearance of an area.

Other Matters

13. Although the Government seeks to increase housebuilding, the provision of one additional unit would make a small meaningful difference to the existing housing supply. Economic advantages would arise from the construction and occupation of a new house, although some of these would be temporary and limited by the scale of the scheme. I would therefore ascribe limited weight to these matters, which would not outweigh the harm identified above.

Conclusion

14. Although the proposed dwelling would not cause harm to the character and appearance of the area, the site does not represent a suitable location for housing. The proposal conflicts with the development plan and the material considerations do not indicate that the appeal should be decided other than in accordance with it. The proposal is therefore dismissed.

D Ellis

INSPECTOR