



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 June 2019

by K Ford MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25 June 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/N2535/W/19/3223529

Land adjacent Belmont Legsby Road, Linwood, Market Rasen LN8 3DZ

- 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 Mrs Ann Griffiths against the decision of West Lindsey District Council.
 - The application Ref 138375, dated 19 September 2018, was refused by notice dated 7 November 2018.
 - The development proposed is described as 'single residential dwelling (bungalow) plot site 0.24 hectares. Existing access/ gateway to plot site from Legsby Road'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. Since determination of the planning application a revised version of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) has been published in February 2019. References to the NPPF in this Decision consequently reflect the 2019 NPPF.
3. The application is in outline with all matters reserved. I have determined the appeal on that basis.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is whether the appeal site represents an appropriate location for housing having regard to national and local policies which seek to protect the character and appearance of the countryside.

Reasons

5. The appeal site is a square shaped plot of paddock land, largely bounded by a mix of trees and hedgerow. Whilst located close to a neighbouring property, Belmont, there are open fields to the north, east and south contributing to a rural open character. The site is located outside the nearby settlements of Linwood and Market Rasen and so for planning purposes is located in the countryside.
6. Policy LP2 of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan (Local Plan) identifies a spatial strategy and settlement hierarchy that directs development to appropriate locations. This policy, along with Policy LP55 of the Local Plan restricts

development in the countryside to that which meets an identified criteria. On the evidence before me the proposal does not meet that criteria.

7. The appellant has identified that the site is a 20 minute walk from schools, a supermarket, shops, Festival Hall, leisure centre, doctors surgery and dentist. However, I am not convinced that access to the facilities would be via a desirable route for families with young children, older people and those with mobility issues. This is because of the unlit, high speed nature of the road and the absence of a footpath along part of the route, even if the grass verge that exists is well maintained.
8. The appellant has identified alternative walking routes into Market Rasen. Although they would be traffic free, from my observations on my site visit they would not address the other concerns identified. The occupants of the dwelling in all likelihood would be reliant on the car to access services and facilities to meet day to day needs. I do not therefore consider that the proposal would support the provisions of paragraph 103 of the NPPF which states that planning should actively manage patterns of growth to support the use of public transport, walking and cycling.
9. The new dwelling would provide some benefit in terms of supporting housing supply. However, the addition of one property would have a minimal impact on housing provision in the area and would be significantly and demonstrably outweighed by the harm I have identified.
10. I note the appellant's willingness to provide a high quality design and that they identify that the design and other reserved matters, including landscaping would not cause harm. Even if this were the case, it would not address the harm created by the location of the development.
11. The proposal would be sited in an inappropriate location which would harm the character and appearance of the countryside. It would therefore conflict with Policy LP1 and Policy LP2 of the Local Plan which supports sustainable development in appropriate locations and Policy LP55 of the Local Plan which supports new dwellings in the countryside where it is essential for the effective operation of rural operations.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons identified, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

K Ford

INSPECTOR