

An instance of the Planning application comment form has been submitted on 18/04/2019.
The reference number is FS114605681.

Customer Name:

Title	First name	Last name
Mr	Paul	Bosanquet

Customer Address:

Flat	House	Street	Locality / Village	Town	Postcode
	ERMINE	LITTLE LANE		WRABBY	DN20 8RW

Customer Contact Details:

Email Address	Phone Number
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]

Application reference: PA/2019/460

Do you.....: Object to proposal

Comments: Generic Objection to All applications outside the approved Boundary for Wrawby

Dear sir

As you are aware I/we have written to the NLC over several applications for requests to build outside the approved boundary for Wrawby and the points are similar in most cases so hopefully the content below is acceptable and will be put on the portal as an objection to this application

We accept that there are certain aspects of planning where committee involvement does not always ensure that there is an agreement with the recommendation of the case officer, and conversely, examples where certain aspects of policies are overlooked in favour of sustainable development.

However, where there are clear statements in the policies that have gone through their due process and examinations by Inspectors, I would expect that members and officers alike would be fully aware of the policies that have been adopted by the Council and that form the Development Plan.

As you will no doubt be are aware the following developments are already approved outside the defined settlement limit for Wrawby and we believe more will follow as there seems to be a vested interest in the continued expansion of the village, without the facilities to seemingly support such extensive housing growth in Wrawby. The following submissions evidence of such expansion. A total of 35 dwellings, an approximate a 5% increase in the housing stock since the last census?

PA2018/1718 1 dwelling – Garden infill

PA/2018/2356 8 dwellings

PA/2018/520 4 dwellings

1. The core strategy, which was adopted in June 2011 sets out the long term vision for North Lincolnshire and provides a blueprint for managing growth and development in the area up to 2026.

a. This is the most important element of the North Lincolnshire local development framework and is part of the development plan for North Lincolnshire and used to make decisions on planning applications, which itself is underpinned by the Revised National Planning Policy Framework. I note that the village does not as yet have its own neighbourhood plan as yet?

2. Policy CS3 – Development Limits.

a. Planning policy statement 3 was amended under the coalition government to reflect the new considerations of garden land as ‘greenfield’ as opposed to ‘brownfield’ or as otherwise to ‘previously developed land’. Obviously now this document has been superseded by the National Planning Policy Framework, which itself has subsequently been revised.

The exclusion of paddocks and large rear gardens identified in Policy CS3 – Development Limits is one such example where there are no exceptions to what is and what is not a suitable location to develop.

Policy CS3 goes on to confirm that “Development outside these defined boundaries will be restricted to that which is essential to the functioning of the countryside. This will include uses such as that related to agriculture, forestry or other uses which require a countryside location or that which will contribute to the sustainable development of the tourist industry”

In this context, and whilst judgements need to be reached independently on applications, the clear exclusion of these areas as being suitable for development should alone be lead to a recommendation of refusal, which should the applicant be minded to test that on appeal. That in my view would be a more appropriate line for the Council to take, especially given the extensive consultation and examination that the Plan has gone through to achieve adopted status? In this context, the decisions made on residential schemes that are not confirming to all aspects of Policy CS3 are contrary to the adopted plan?

b. As you are aware, garden land is therefore no longer considered to constitute ‘previously developed land’, thus removing the principle for development upon such land. Policy CS3 appears to be broadly in line with this, although it references exclusively rear gardens, not side or front.

3. With reference to the committee report we believe there is a discrepancy in the Publicity sections figures and these unduly favour the applicant.

a. It states 19 letters of support submitted from 15 individuals with 3 objections but there are 55 letters on the portal (not 19) 14 are objections (not 3).

4. Out of the 14 objections 8 are residents from little lane. This equates to 90% of the residents down little lane objecting.

5. The Committee report refers to the previous appeal and infers that when the outline planning for the PA/2018/674 (22 houses) is passed it changes the rules by removing one of the elements

identified by the inspector from 'Harm exists to Harm no longer exists', this is a dangerous argument as it has nothing to do with this application and will open the flood gates to other large developments in Wrawby that have had applications rejected.

I acknowledge that the decision of the Planning Inspector may have some bearing on the submission, but the matter of precedent is difficult to argue, as 'each case must be judged on its own merits', and no two sites are the same, and neither generally are the issues that affect them.

Again, I understand that the Council have a duty to maintain a deliverable 5 year supply of housing, and whilst I do not know the precise nature of how you calculate your housing supply figures, I would question if any outline consents could be classed as a deliverable commitment on the basis that they require a 'reserved matters' submission, and on that basis cannot be built out and more importantly, should not be included within the 5 year supply figures? On this basis, therefore, should the issue of the lack of supply be brought forward as an argument to support a positive recommendation on outline submissions, when essentially they are not a commitment?

I would be grateful if you could provide some detail on how the housing supply figures are calculated to aid mine, and my neighbours understanding.

I would accept that with any full planning application or reserved matters application, that the Council's lack of housing supply weakens the argument against any application for residential schemes that lie on the periphery or adjacent the settlement, provided the development is considered sustainable inter alia.

What I do have significant concerns about is the issue of 'harm'. I am of the opinion that all developments cause harm in one form or another, and it is a consideration as to how significant that harm is, and what benefits does the proposed development deliver in the short and long term? Those benefits may be biodiversity or other environmental enhancements, open space provision, social/affordable provision, healthcare provision amongst other aspects (all related back to the sustainability of the proposals).

Character is a big consideration for any developments. Part of the all-encompassing use of character is 'harm'. Irrespective of supply issues, the 'harm' to the environment, locality, demographics and visual amenity of an area inter alia should not override the decision, as sustainable development and judging each case on its own merits should in my opinion be judged upon those golden threads that run through planning and decision making.

Of significant interest and relevance is a recent appeal decision where the impact upon the character of the area is one of the determining factors. The location of that appeal, which was dismissed being at Hillborn House, Brigg Road, Wrawby DN20 8RQ. Application reference PA/2018/1400 relates. On the basis of the acceptance of other schemes where harm was difficult to argue in the opinion of the Council due to an appeal decision, am I now to assume that all applications for housing schemes outside the settlement boundary can now be refused on the basis of harm due to this more recent appeal decision? Your clarification would be appreciated.

The term sustainability references three main areas; these being social, economic and environmental impacts. The use of the term 'harm' needs to be taken across all of these elements. I cannot agree with your interpretation of harm, and the apparent change of opinion as to what amounts to harm. An appeal decision upon one site should not affect the views on the impact upon

the character (harm) upon another, so I struggle to see how such a converse argument could be put forward based on an appeal decision on a different site, when 'each case must be judged on its own merits. There are no fundamental changes in circumstance with the character and appearance of the site in question, so why should a completely different view be taken on what is essentially the same submission?

This is a very dangerous precedent that the Council has set insofar as its ability to continue to either resist or seek to approve residential schemes, not just in Wrawby, but elsewhere in the Council's administrative area, given each site has its own character and identity, and a broad brush approach of a fundamental change in circumstances could be used across the board.

This however does not take away the fact that the Council's own adopted policies exclude rear gardens and paddocks from development?

We cannot understand how NLC can approve planning outside the approved boundary when we do not have the facilities to continue to support such schemes, as the granting of permission would not create additional employment opportunities within the village, nor would it support economic growth insofar as the creation of a new commercial venture (i.e. shop) etc., growth in the public transport infrastructure or recreational spaces for existing and new residents for example.

Essentially, Wrawby is at risk of being a dormitory settlement for Brigg, with the private car being a preferred mode of transport. So essentially, the continued growth of the village would in the long term not be representative of sustainable development, as there would be environmental (loss of green spaces, potential harm to biodiversity, pollution etc.) social (a lack of facilities to support growth etc) and economic (no prospect of commercial growth or investment in local services and facilities)?