

**North Lincolnshire Local Development Framework  
Housing & Employment Land Allocations DPD – Independent Examination  
Inspector’s Requests for Information – Day 6: Development Limits – Scawby  
Re-Examination of Mr Hanson’s Proposal**

Having read the above document from North Lincolnshire Council, referenced Exam 71, I would like to make the following comments:

In the introduction the council’s comment saying that I did not agree with the partial amendment reads as if I do not want the properties included within the development limit. This is incorrect. I merely questioned their decision to split the properties from the land at the back which was at odds with CS3 which states that where possible limits should follow clearly defined features or constraints.

In their conclusion the council agree that it would be appropriate to include the whole area of land within the development limit which in itself, I would have thought, should be enough to justify the moving of the limit thus putting an end to the matter. However, now their key concern appears to be with the recent refusals for planning permission. With reference to the planning history, I don’t believe that the council’s inclusion of previous planning applications in their argument against is justified. Reasons 1 and 3 (limit and design) for refusal of planning permission on the council’s reply are linked to the development limit. I am now in a Catch-22 position where spatial planning is refusing to move the development limit because of the planning department’s refusal and the planning department is refusing permission because spatial planning has placed my property outside the limit! The other reasons for refusal should be dealt with through the normal planning process and I don’t feel this is an appropriate time to address the matter. However, if the inspector thinks that tandem development, character, impact on amenity and reduction in highway safety are valid reasons for not moving the development limit I would request an opportunity to discuss this further.

To further back up my argument for inclusion I would like to draw your attention to a few examples of inconsistencies in the drawing of Scawby Village’s development limit:

The council are concerned that, if they were to include our property within the limit, two further plots of land, namely to the rear of Dealside and adjacent to Home Farm, would need to be included as well. On the map below I have highlighted 3 areas numbered 1 – 3 as examples of large domestic gardens/ plots of land which are included within the limit. I can’t see the difference between these 3 plots and the Home Farm and Dealside areas. Surely the council should apply the same guidelines to all five plots and take this opportunity to include the Home Farm and Dealside plots within the development limit. For your information, the Home Farm and Dealside plots are owned by the Nelthorpe Estate. The land to the rear of Dealside is the garden for Joiner’s Cottage and the land adjacent to Home Farm is the only garden attached to a prestigious large farm house and therefore, in reality, unlikely to be ever subject to further development.

The council agreed before the hearing to fully include land to the side of and behind 6 Messingham Lane, Scawby within the development limit (ID: 267547 and 828063). The only significant difference between their submission and mine appears to be that they have not previously applied for planning

permission and I have. Surely the council cannot be so naïve to think that this plot will not be subject to a planning application in the future? This leaves me wondering that, if they had applied for planning permission before the change of the development limit and were refused on similar reasons to mine (which considering the position and type of plot would have been likely), would spatial planning still be willing to change the limit? Also, surely the council's concerns regarding the inclusion of the land adjacent to Home Farm and the rear of Dealside could also be applied to the parcel of land adjacent to 6 Messingham Lane on the corner of Messingham Lane and Vicarage Lane, reference **A** on map below, but this doesn't appear to have been an issue.

I believe I have demonstrated both in my written and verbal representations, that North Lincolnshire Council, when drawing up the original development limit, used maps indicating boundaries that were at best misleading and at worst incorrect and it is this evidence which led them to placing my properties and land outside the development limit. I am aware that inclusion in the development limit is no guarantee for planning consent but it appears as if a very complex framework of documents is being applied rigidly to a very minor plot of land which in the grand scheme of things has, in my opinion, no effect on the overall character of Scawby village and its inhabitants. It doesn't need the additional restriction of a development limit.

Steve Hanson

08/02/2015

