



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 September 2025

by M James BA (Hons) Dip TP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23rd October 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/N2535/W/25/3365432

Land off Common Road, Waddingham, Gainsborough, Lincolnshire, DN21 4SY

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant outline planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr J Waite against the decision of West Lindsey District Council.
 - The application Ref is WL/2024/00560.
 - The development proposed is described as “Erection of four dwellings with alterations to existing access in outline form with all matters reserved”.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. Planning permission for the proposed development of four dwellings was refused by the Council on 12 November 2024. An update to the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) was subsequently published in December 2024. However, the revisions made to the Framework are not considered to be determinative for this appeal.
3. The application was submitted in outline form with all matters (access, appearance, landscaping, layout and scale) reserved for future consideration.
4. The draft Waddingham and Brandy Wharf Neighbourhood Plan was subject to public consultation in the first half of 2019 and the Council in its appeal statement has explained the emerging plan has progressed no further. I therefore consider very limited weight should be attached to the emerging neighbourhood plan for the purposes of the determination of this appeal and below I have made no further reference to it.

Main Issue

5. The effect of the proposed development on the core, shape and form of Waddingham and whether it would lie within the village’s developed footprint.

Reasons

6. Waddingham is defined as a medium village in the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan (CLLP) 2023. Waddingham is situated within the open countryside, which largely comprises of arable farmland. The site is located at the southern end of the village and comprises a pocket of undeveloped land (the pocket) which helps to define the shape and form of the village. The pocket is partially within agricultural use and bounded by development on three sides.

7. The land immediately to the south of the site opens out into the wider undeveloped countryside. Adjoining the site to the west is arable farmland within the pocket and further west there are dwellings on The Wolds and Joshua Way. To the north-west is a further open field with a public right of way along its north-western perimeter connecting Joshua Way with Common Road. The public right of way appears to be in use, given what I saw of its condition during my site visit. Adjoining the appeal site to the north and east there are dwellings that form part of the village including The Laurels, Rosemount, Rosemount Cottage, Maple Lodge and Chapel Farm. Chapel Farm being a grade II listed building dating from 1740.
8. The proposed development would introduce four dwellings into the pocket. Whilst all matters have been reserved for future consideration, the submitted indicative site plan shows the proposed dwellings would be sited towards the western boundary, to the west of Maple Lodge and to the south of The Laurels. The land immediately to the east of the proposed dwellings has been identified as grassland with an attenuation pond. Along the southern edge of the site, there is an existing track connecting with Common Road and it is proposed that the track would be widened in places to provide access to the proposed dwellings.
9. The development of four dwellings would serve to partially close off the pocket from the immediately adjoining wider open countryside to the south and extend the built form of the village. The encroachment of development at the southern end of the village's developed area would have the effect of extending the village that I consider would not retain the core shape and form of the settlement as required to qualify as an appropriate location under Policy S4 of the CLLP.
10. Furthermore, whilst there is not a clearly delineated settlement edge, I consider the site relates more to the surrounding countryside than to the built-up area of Waddingham. There is a clear relationship and strong connectivity of the site with the expansive agricultural land to the south. Travelling along the access track in a westerly direction beyond the grounds of Maple Lodge provides a clear sense of entering the open countryside, with the pattern of built development being much looser as compared with parts of Waddingham to the north. The open vista looking south from the Maple Lodge access track would be retained with the dwellings in place, however, it would be reduced when looking west. Part of the site is also currently within agricultural use.
11. Users of the public right of way travelling east from Joshua Way would also experience a reduced vista to the wider countryside to the south with an increased degree of enclosure. That would be indicative of what would be an expansion of the developed footprint of the village which I consider would be harmful to the area's character. As such, the appeal site is not considered to fall within the developed footprint of Waddingham and the proposed development would have the effect of extending that footprint because the site relates more to the surrounding countryside.
12. The appellant has referred to four large open areas in close proximity to the appeal site, namely, the school playing field, the open area to the north of Rosemount Cottage, the Common and the area to the north west of the appeal site as more closely relating to the village than the countryside and which are reflective of the pattern of development. The appellant highlights that three of these areas were formerly protected as open space/frontages in the now superseded 2006 West Lindsey Local Plan. Their designation in that plan having been result of the

consideration of the character of the settlement and the integral role of open spaces within the developed footprint of the settlement. The appellant contends that these sites were protected as they contributed to the character of the settlement in the same way that paragraph 135 of the Framework suggests.

13. However, as acknowledged by the appellant, those open areas are no longer designated as open spaces and this appeal must be determined in the context of the current relevant policies, namely Policies S1 and S4 of the CLLP which accord with the Framework.
14. In addition, reference has been made to the Council's granting of planning permission for the dwellings that have extended The Wolds. However, that development was pursuant to the then extant policies contained in the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan 2017 which have been superseded by the policies of the CLLP 2023.
15. For the reasons given above, I consider the proposed development would not form part of the developed footprint of Waddingham and it would harm the core, shape and form of the village. Accordingly, the proposed development would conflict with Policy S1 and S4 of the CLLP.

Other Matters

16. Under section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 special regard is to be paid to the desirability of preserving the setting of buildings of special architectural or historic interest. The existing access track which would provide access to the proposed dwellings is adjacent to the grade II listed building.
17. The proposed development would include the removal of a small section of stone wall at the access track's junction with Common Road and the removal of trees and shrubs to facilitate the track's widening and surfacing. Having regard to the scale of the proposed development and its siting relative to the listed building, I consider there would be no harm to the listed building and that its setting would be preserved.
18. The provision of four dwellings would make a modest contribution to the supply of housing within the Council's area. However, I consider that benefit of the proposed development would not outweigh the harm that I have identified above.

Conclusion

19. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal be dismissed.

M James

INSPECTOR