



## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 October 2020

**by Paul Cooper MSc MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22 October 2020

---

### **Appeal Ref: APP/N2535/W/20/3254975**

### **Land r/o Charolands, Ingham Road, Stow, Lincolnshire LN1 2DG**

- 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 Mr & Mrs Martinson against the decision of West Lindsey District Council.
  - The application Ref 140899, dated 3 April 2020, was refused by notice dated 10 June 2020.
  - The development proposed is outline planning permission for 2no dwellings with access to be considered and all other matters reserved for subsequent applications.
- 

### **Decision**

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### **Procedural Matter**

2. The application is made in outline with means of access to be determined at this stage. The applicant has also submitted an indicative site layout and I have had regard to this in determining the appeal.

### **Main Issue**

3. The main issue in this appeal is whether the location of the appeal site is suitable in terms of local and national planning policy.

### **Reasons**

4. Policy LP2 of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan (2017) (The LP) identifies levels of settlement hierarchy across the local planning authority areas. Tier six is small villages and Policy LP4 seeks to control development in that tier and provides a sequential test for development sites and also states that the development sites should be in an appropriate location. Policy LP2 states that an appropriate location is one that does not conflict with local or national planning policy as a whole and would also retain the core shape and form of the settlement, not harm the character and appearance of the settlement or surrounding countryside.
5. The appeal site is a parcel of land located to the rear of "Ash Trees" but is currently accessed from "Charolands" and forms part of an agricultural holding. An agricultural building dominates the site. The site is generally unkempt in nature with various agricultural implements dotted around the site.
6. Policy LP4 also refers to the expected growth of Stow as a sixth-tier settlement, which is indicated at a level of 10%, calculated at 17 dwellings. From the evidence in front of me, this has been met by completed dwellings and those

under construction, as well as existing approvals, and therefore the appeal proposal falls foul of the designation.

7. Policy LP2 states that in the event of the growth figure being met, then two additional scenarios come into play to allow for initial growth, which are promotion in the Neighbourhood Plan or a clear demonstration of community support.
8. At present, initial work has started on a Neighbourhood Plan for the area but this can attract no weight at present.
9. The second criteria relates to community support. The appellants have considered proportionate support to be the surrounding properties and landowners. It has also included the builder of the approved properties adjacent the site.
10. I find that the exercise cannot be considered proportionate, in that it only contained properties surrounding the site, one of which the Council have indicated was missed, adjacent the site entrance. This consultation exercise is akin to a Local Authority consultation rather than a full support exercise and as a result I find that it does not meet the criteria set out in Policy LP2 for a suitable community support exercise. Incidentally the proposal does not carry the support of the Parish Council, as set out in the text of the Policy.
11. Whilst there would be benefits from the loss of the agricultural building from a visual point of view, that does not outweigh the fact that the growth figure for the village has already been met, and clear demonstration of community support, has in my opinion, not been correctly demonstrated.
12. Overall, I find that the appeal site would not be an appropriate location for residential development as it would not meet the criteria set out in the requirements of Policies LP2 and LP4 of the Local Plan.

### **Other Matters**

13. I have also been referred to other developments in the village. I do not have the full details in support of the applications for planning permission before me and I can therefore attach only limited weight to the extant permissions. In any event I must determine this appeal on its own merits and such weight as can be given is not sufficient to overcome the issues in terms of the growth allocation and the lack of evidence to demonstrate appropriate community support.
14. The proposals would offer two new dwellings with the accompanying social and economic benefits of new housing, the dwellings would provide an additional two housing units to meet housing need. These factors do favour the proposal, however, given the size of the contribution (two dwellings), the scale of this benefit would be limited and not be significant.
15. The Council has not raised the issue of access to the site in their reasons for refusal and I have no reason to contradict those findings, therefore I will not assess the matter further.

**Conclusion**

16. Therefore, for the reasons given above, and taking into account all other matters, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

*Paul Cooper*

INSPECTOR