

SOUTH HOLLAND DISTRICT COUNCIL

Report of: Development Manager
To: Planning Committee
Author: Mark Simmonds
Subject: Planning Appeals
Purpose: To provide an update on recent Appeal Decisions

Recommendation

a) That the contents of this report be noted

1.0 OVERVIEW

1.1 Since the last report 3 appeal decision(s) have been received, the results are as follows:

Appeals Dismissed:	3
Appeals Allowed:	0
Appeals Part Allowed:	0

1.2 Since the 1st April 2017 193 planning appeal decisions have been received of which 143 have been dismissed, which equates to a success rate of 74.09%

2.0 PLANNING APPEALS DISMISSED

H11-0726-22 Mr K Bunn - Sundas Shaban

Churchills, Long Sutton	APP/A2525/W/22/3310042
Proposed Alteration	Decision Date: 22 nd June 2023
Inspectors finding: Overall, therefore, based on the limited evidence before me, I must take a precautionary approach and find that due to the lack of appropriate off street parking provision, without clear substantive evidence to the contrary, there is a risk the scheme would compromise highway safety in the area. The proposed development therefore conflicts with the aims of Policies 2, 3 and 36 of the LP, which, among other things, seek to ensure new development is served by appropriate parking provision and does not compromise highway safety in the area. I acknowledge the proposal would have economic benefits associated with the provision of new short stay accommodation in the area. I note the comments about other similar developments nearby which have not provided off street parking. However, the full details of those examples are not before me. I have determined the appeal on its merits and none of these matters or any others raised outweigh my findings above. Even though the Highway Authority have not objected to the proposal, this does not mean the scheme, which I have found to be in conflict with the development plan, is acceptable.	

Land to Rear of 29/31 North Street, Crowland	APP/A2525/W/22/3313293
Proposed Dwelling	Decision Date: 3 rd August 2023
<p>Inspectors finding:</p> <p>I conclude that the proposed development would unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the area, including the Crowland CA. This would be contrary to Policies 2, 3 and 29 of the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2011-2036 (LP). Amongst others, these policies seek to retain existing street patterns and historic building lines and achieve high quality design which reinforces local distinctiveness with reference to height, massing, form and plot widths. The proposal would also conflict with the Framework where it seeks to ensure that development would add to the overall quality of the area and be sympathetic to local character.</p> <p>I consider that the increase in vehicular and pedestrian movements resulting from the development would increase the risk of conflict on the highway between other road users. The proposal would therefore result in unacceptable harm to highway and pedestrian safety and would conflict with Policy 2 of the LP which requires access and vehicle generation levels to be adequately accommodated. I also find conflict with the Framework which sets out that development should be prevented or refused where there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety.</p>	

H08-0227-22 Mrs C Wheeler – Catherine Sutton

Fifth Drove, Gosberton Clough	APP/A2525/W/22/3311331
Proposed Dwelling	Decision Date: 4 th August 2023
<p>Inspectors finding:</p> <p>In considering the above aspects in totality, based on the evidence before me and my own observations of the barn, I find that such an extensive amount of materials would require replacement, alongside significant structural works, and propping, such that the proposal would represent a re-build rather than a conversion. Therefore, I find that the proposed development would not comply with Policy 23 criterion 1 of the SELLP.</p> <p>The proposed development would not be in a suitable location for housing, having regard to the local development strategy for the area. It would be contrary to Policies 1 and 23 of the SELLP, and undermine the spatial strategy by directing growth to the wrong place. I give this conflict significant weight.</p>	

3.0 PLANNING APPEALS ALLOWED

None

4.0 ENFORCEMENT APPEALS DISMISSED

None

5.0 ENFORCEMENT APPEALS UPHeld

None

Background Papers - Planning Application and Enforcement Working Files

Lead Contact Officer

Mark Simmonds; Development Manager (Interim)
01775 764444
mark.simmonds@sholland.gov.uk