



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 June 2026

by Mr R Walker BA HONS DIPTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 24 June 2026

Appeal Ref: 6006265

Land adjacent to Rose Cottage, High Street, Faldingworth, Nr Market Rasen LN8 3SE

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant permission in principle.
 - The appeal is made by D Spedding against the decision of West Lindsey District Council.
 - The application Ref is WL/2026/00084.
 - The development proposed was originally described as the development proposed is permission in principle (PiP) to erect up to three (3) dwellings.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Applications for costs

2. An application for costs was made by D Spedding against West Lindsey District Council. This application is the subject of a separate Decision.

Preliminary Matters

3. The proposal is for permission in principle. Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) advises that this is an alternative way of obtaining planning permission for housing-led development. The permission in principle consent route has two stages: the first stage (or permission in principle stage) establishes whether a site is suitable in-principle and the second ('technical details consent') stage is when the detailed development proposals are assessed. This appeal relates to the first of these two stages.
4. The scope of the considerations for permission in principle is limited to location, land use and the amount of development permitted¹. All other matters are considered as part of a subsequent Technical Details Consent (TDC) application if permission in principle is granted. I have determined the appeal accordingly.

Main Issues

5. The main issues are whether the site is suitable for residential development, having regard to its location, the proposed land use and the amount of development, with particular reference to:
 - The character and appearance of the surrounding area; and
 - Any archaeological interests within the site.

¹ PPG Paragraph: 012 Reference ID: 58-012-20180615

Reasons

Character and appearance

6. The appeal site is an open parcel of land that extends from High Street wrapping around to the rear of properties. This part of High Street is characterised by predominantly linear housing fronting onto the street with only a small number of sporadic individual exceptions. Instead, the natural open undeveloped qualities of the appeal site, along with trees and vegetation, combined with other elements such as car parking, outbuildings and rear gardens on land behind the frontage housing results in a verdant semi-rural quality as the built form of the village dissipates into the countryside to the north.
7. The introduction of up to three dwellings would result in a small group of houses, which due to the need for access would push development to the rear. This amount of housing together as a group in this rear location would be at odds with the prevailing pattern of housing fronting High Street with only sporadic individual exceptions. Moreover, the amount of housing, and its associated land use, would erode the more open and verdant qualities of the site, which contribute to the area's transitional landscape character.
8. The presence of features such as the car park adjacent to the site, and the windmill development and other sporadic individual properties set to the rear of the High Street, would mean that the appeal scheme would not be an isolated feature. However, this would not overcome my concerns regarding the amount of development in this location, which would still not preserve or enhance the settlement's character but instead harm it. Moreover, whilst there has been consent for a single dwelling within part of the appeal site in the past, from the evidence before me, this consented location would have maintained the predominantly linear character of the houses along High Street in contrast with the appeal scheme. It does not therefore justify the harm that I have identified.
9. I therefore conclude on this main issue that the site is not suitable for residential development, having regard to its location, the proposed land use and the amount of development, with particular reference to the character and appearance of the surrounding area. As such, the proposal for permission in principle would be contrary to the requirements of Policies S1 and S4 of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan, when taken together and in so far as they relate to this main issue. These say, amongst other things, that residential development proposals for unallocated sites within the size thresholds set out in part 1 of this policy and within the developed footprint of the village will only be supported where it would preserve or enhance the settlement's character and appearance.

Archaeological interests

10. The Council advise that Faldingworth dates to at least the early medieval period. Moreover, there has been Romano British and prehistoric archaeological evidence recorded within the settlement. The appellant has not disputed this categorisation of the potential archaeological interests around the settlement.
11. In this regard, the evidence before me indicates that the settlement holds potential for sites with archaeological interest. However, there is no substantive evidence that the appeal site holds a level of archaeological interest that would preclude up to three dwellings in principle. I am also mindful that the Council has previously,

and relatively recently, granted consent for a single dwelling in part of the appeal site.

12. The National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) and the PPG² require that where a site has the potential to include heritage assets with archaeological interest, then an appropriate desk-based assessment and where necessary a field evaluation should be submitted.
13. However, the site will not benefit from planning permission until such time as the TDC has been granted. If archaeological assets were found at the TDC stage and were of such significance that their loss could not be mitigated against and would preclude development of up to three dwellings across the site, the Council still has the power to refuse TDC consent. As such, I am satisfied that addressing this matter at the TDC stage would be in line with the Framework and the PPG in this instance.
14. Drawing the above together, I can not conclude that the site is not suitable for residential development, having regard to its location, the proposed land use and the amount of development, with particular reference to any archaeological interests within the site. As such, I do not find conflict with the requirements of Policy S57 of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan or paragraphs 207 and 208 of the Framework, when taken together and in so far as they relate to this main issue. These say, amongst other things, that development affecting archaeological remains, whether known or potential, designated or undesignated, should take every practical and reasonable step to protect and, where possible, enhance their significance.

Other Matters

15. The proposal would provide up to three residential units which would contribute to the supply of housing in the area. Moreover, economic and social benefits would flow from their construction and occupation. The scheme would therefore help support the Government's objective of significantly boosting the supply of homes. However, I have no substantive evidence of a shortfall in housing land supply in the area limiting the weight I afford these more generalised housing benefits. The absence of harm in principle in relation to other matters weighs neither for nor against the proposal.
16. In contrast, the amount of development in this location would result in harm to the character and appearance of the area. This would bring conflict with the development plan when taken as a whole. To allow development contrary to the development plan would undermine and dilute the plan-led system and the future pattern of development in the area. In this regard, the more generalised benefits from the scheme, are not sufficient to outweigh my findings in relation to the conflict with the development plan from the appeal proposal.
17. Concerns regarding the processing of the application are not issues that I can assess as part of this appeal. The validity or not of such matters do not affect the planning merits or effects of the proposal before me.

² Paragraph 207 and Paragraph: 041 Reference ID: 18a-041-20190723

Conclusion

18. 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. For the reasons given above the appeal should be dismissed.

Mr R Walker

INSPECTOR