

ASSESSMENT AGAINST POLICY CS3 CRITERIA

Core Strategy policy CS3 sets out the primary framework for establishing development limits around settlements in North Lincolnshire.

Existing development patterns - *the development limit will be drawn around the main built up area of the settlement. Scattered, sporadic or dispersed development or buildings separated from the main body of the settlement by areas of undeveloped land, roads or industrial areas will not be included. Where possible, limits should follow clearly defined features or constraints such as roads.*

It is clear from a site visit as well as examining maps and aerial photography that the two properties “The Bungalow” and “Belmont” form part of the built up area for Scawby and as such it is appropriate to include them within the development limit for the village. The land to the rear was highlighted as being related to “Belmont” in terms of ownership – this issue is not in dispute.

Capacity - *the ability of the settlement to accommodate future development based on existing and proposed infrastructure, on its access to facilities and services and levels of public transport. This also includes the availability of previously developed land.*

Scawby is reasonably well provided for in terms of access to services and infrastructure – it has a primary school, pub, church and shop. The Sustainable Settlement Survey identifies it as the 23rd most sustainable settlement in the North Lincolnshire area. Opportunities for development on previously developed land are limited.

Existing planning consents/development - *land with planning consent for residential development or community facilities where development has been implemented.*

Both properties have been situated on the site for some time. However, the land to the rear has a recent planning history dating to 1996. More recently, two planning applications for the erection of two dwellings were refused (March & December 2014 respectively) (see planning history, below).

Character - *the limit will be drawn to reflect the need to protect and enhance settlement character. This means protecting areas of open space or land with the characteristics of open countryside within and adjacent to settlements by not including them within development limits. Large rear gardens or paddocks stretching well out the villages built form will also be excluded.*

On further examination, the land to the rear of “Belmont” and “The Bungalow” does not appear to be open in nature nor have any characteristics associated with the open countryside. It appears more domestic in nature. However, it needs to be considered that if included within the development limit, this land may be the subject of proposals for development and, as highlighted in the refusals of planning permission (see below) may have an adverse impact on the character of the area.

PLANNING HISTORY

A search of council records shows that the properties and area of land have a recent planning history. This is set out below:

- PA/1996/1347 – Planning permission to erect extension to existing dwelling to provide kitchen, bathroom, lobby area, store room, family room and garden store at ground floor level, and 2 bedrooms, landing and shower room at first floor level. Granted with conditions.
- PA/2005/0284 – Planning permission to erect single storey, pitched roof extension. Granted with conditions (12.04.05)
- PA/2014/0030 – Planning permission to erect two detached dwellings and two detached garages. Submitted: 22.01.14. Refused: 14.03.14

- PA/2014/1015 – Planning permission to erect two detached dwellings and two detached garages (re-submission of PA/2014/1015). Submitted: 02.09.14. Refused: 08.12.14

In terms of recent applications to erect two dwellings, both were refused for similar reasons – location, tandem development, amenity impacts and design. The second application (PA/2014/1015) was also refused on highway safety and heritage grounds.

Firstly, that the site lay outside the development limit for Scawby as set out in the North Lincolnshire Plan which restricts development to that which is essential to the functioning of agriculture or forestry enterprises. No information was supplied to outline whether or not the dwelling related to the need to accommodate workers. As such it was considered to be contrary to policies RD2 (North Lincs Local Plan) and CS1, CS2 & CS3 (Core Strategy).

Secondly, it was stated that the proposal would create an unacceptable form of tandem development, which was considered to be out of character with area, whilst the additional traffic movements to and from the proposed dwellings would unacceptably harm the amenity of the existing properties known as “The Bungalow” and “Belmont”. The proposal was therefore, contrary to policy H7 (North Lincs Local Plan).

Thirdly, the designs of the dwellings are not considered to be truly innovative or of high quality as defined in paragraph 55 of the National Planning Policy Framework for them to be treated exceptionally. The proposal is therefore considered contrary to policies DS1 of the North Lincolnshire Local Plan, CS5 of the North Lincolnshire Core Strategy and paragraph 55 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Fourthly (for PA/2014/1015), it was stated that due to limited visibility at the junction of the private drive and the adopted highway, it is considered that any additional vehicle movements generated by further development in this location would result in an unacceptable reduction in highway safety contrary to policies DS1 and T2 of the North Lincolnshire Local Plan.

Fifthly (for PA/2014/1015), it was considered that there is insufficient information to assess the application as the Heritage Impact Statement as part of the Design and Access Statement is not of sufficient content to evaluate the impacts and any resulting heritage benefits of this proposal. In addition, there are concerns about the proposed design and without adequate justification, the application cannot be supported for non-compliance with Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservations Areas Act) 1990 and is therefore considered to be contrary to policies DS1 and HE2 of the North Lincolnshire Local Plan and CS6 of the North Lincolnshire Core Strategy.

CONCLUSION

Having further examined the proposal put forward by Mr. Hanson, it may be appropriate to include the whole area of land within the development limit as it would meet the tests specified in Core Strategy Policy CS3. However, the key concern in doing so relates to the reasons for the two recent refusals of planning permission to construct two detached dwellings, in particular those related to the creation of tandem development, character, impact on amenity and reduction in highway safety.

The inclusion of the land within the development limit would not be a guarantee that development would automatically be permitted, as the issues raised by both refusals would need to be properly addressed. Policy CS1 requires development in rural settlements to be “..in keeping with the character and nature of the settlement”,

A further consideration relates to potential for adjacent land to be brought within the development. Should Mr. Hanson’s proposal be accepted it would have the effect of bring two other areas of land within the development limit – to the rear of “Dealside” and adjacent to “Home Farm”. Aerial photography suggests that these areas are currently used as domestic gardens.

At this point in time, the council could not support extending the development limit for Scawby to include the full area of land to rear of “Belmont” and “The Bungalow”, Park Lane, Scawby. It is noted that the Inspector is looking at the proposed development limit amendment suggested by the council together with that suggested by Mr. Hanson in the overall context of the village, and may reach a different conclusion.