

[06] Full Planning Permission

N/191/02200/ 23 **APPLICANT:** Mr. P. Odling,

VALID: 30/11/2023 **AGENT:** Mr. A. Pettifor,

PROPOSAL: Planning Permission - Erection of a two storey dwelling, outbuildings and landscaping on site of an existing agricultural barn which is to be demolished.

LOCATION: LAND OFF, CHURCH LANE, ULCEBY

1.0 REASONS FOR COMMITTEE CONSIDERATION

1.1 The application is referred to committee following a call in request by Cllr Eyre. It is considered that it would also constitute a departure from the Local Plan.

2.0 THE SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

2.1 The site is located within the hamlet of Ulceby, it is within the Lincolnshire Wolds Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB). The site lies on Church Lane within a cluster of dwellings close to the junction with the A1028. It comprises a 0.24ha rectangular area occupied by a barn with land to the front (west) and rear (east). It is accessed off Church Lane. A row of trees are along the west boundary, two are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (TPO). The site lies between two dwellings, Braewater House, a two-storey dwelling to the south, and The Lodge, a bungalow to the north. Church Lane runs along the west side of the site and agricultural land is to the rear (east). On the opposite side of Church Lane there is a row of terrace dwellings. The wider area is surrounded by agricultural land. 150m to the north-west of the site is The Peacocks, a grade II listed building, and 260m north is the Church of All Saints, also grade II listed. The site lies in flood zone 1.

3.0 DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSAL

3.1 Planning Permission - Erection of a two storey dwelling, outbuildings and landscaping on site of an existing agricultural barn which is to be demolished.

3.2 The application proposes a scheme of outstanding architectural value, endeavouring to offer a development of exceptional architectural quality and biodiversity enhancements. The existing barn on the site would be demolished and a 2-storey 5-bedroom dwelling with associated outbuildings and landscaping is proposed, the dwelling would include a single storey annexe linked to the main dwelling and storage buildings. The dwelling would take the form of a farmstead arrangement with courtyards. The proposal seeks to have a high standard of efficiency through its design and

use of technology (air source heat pumps and solar array). It also seeks to increase biodiversity.

4.0 CONSULTATION

4.1 Set out below are the consultation responses that have been received on this application. These responses may be summarised, and full copies are available for inspection separately. Some of the comments made may not constitute material planning considerations.

Publicity

4.2 The application has been advertised as a departure from the Local Plan by means of a press notice and site notice, neighbours have also been notified in writing.

Consultees

4.3 PARISH COUNCIL - No response received.

4.4 LCC HIGHWAYS AND LEAD LOCAL FLOOD AUTHORITY - No objection subject to informative.

4.5 ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES (Environmental Protection) - No response received.

4.6 ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES (Drainage) - No response received.

4.7 ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES (Contamination) – Phase 1 assessment requested or in absence of this condition recommended. Report submitted by applicant and Environmental Health re-consulted. No response at the time of writing this report.

4.8 LINCOLNSHIRE WILDLIFE TRUST – Initially object due to lack of ecology survey. Report submitted and re-consultation carried out. Objection withdrawn.

4.9 STREETSCENE – Object to the loss of trees, which are subject to Tree Preservation Orders, as outlined in the visual tree report.

4.10 LINCOLNSHIRE WOLDS COUNTRYSIDE SERVICE - No response received.

4.11 LCC HIGHWAYS AND PLANNING - No response received.

Neighbours

4.12 Representations of support received from the following addresses on the grounds of:

- 1 The development would remove an eyesore building, a former cattle yard, it is in a residential environmental and looks out of place.

- The building/barn on site is in disrepair.
- The proposal would bring a redundant site back into positive use.
- Church Lane is a residential lane.
- A new dwelling would be welcome.
- Well designed dwelling will enhance the village and add to the character.
- Improvement to biodiversity.
- Improve neighbourhood safety by occupying the space rather than offering temptation for opportunists.

4.13 Neutral representation received making suggestions for provisions for swifts.

4.14 The Ward Councillor is aware of the application via the Weekly List.

5.0 RELEVANT SITE HISTORY

5.1 None for the application site.

6.0 PLANNING POLICY

6.1 Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires that planning applications are determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The Development Plan comprises of the East Lindsey Local Plan (adopted 2018), including the Core Strategy and the Settlement Proposals Development Plan Document; and any made Neighbourhood Plans. The Government's National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) is a material consideration.

East Lindsey Local Plan

SP1 – A Sustainable Pattern of Place

SP2 – Sustainable Development

SP3 – Housing Growth and the Location of Inland Growth

SP10 – Design

SP 11 – Historic Environment

SP16 – Inland Flood Risk

SP22 - Transport and Accessibility

SP23 - Landscape

SP24 - Biodiversity and Geodiversity

National Planning Policy Framework

Paras 82-84, 108, 109, 135, 180 and 182

Planning Documents

PPG

East Lindsey Landscape Character Assessment 2009

7.0 OFFICER ASSESSMENT OF THE PROPOSAL

Main Planning Issues

- 7.1 The main planning issues in this case are considered to be:
- Principle of development in this location in terms of sustainability
 - Design quality
 - Impact on the immediate setting and the defining characteristics of the local area including the AONB
 - Impact on the setting of listed buildings
 - Impact on neighbour amenity

Principle of development in this location in terms of sustainability

- 7.2 The main thrust of the NPPF is for sustainable development. Among the NPPF's core principles is the active management of patterns of growth to make the fullest possible use of public transport, walking and cycling, and to focus significant development in locations which are or can be made sustainable. In rural areas, the NPPF advises that housing should be planned to reflect local need, to promote sustainable development, housing should be located where it would enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities.
- 7.3 SP1 of the East Lindsey Local Plan sets out the settlement hierarchy based on the range of services, facilities and employment available in them. It provides evidence that will help support the assessment of where new growth should be directed. Settlements are defined as either towns or large, medium or small villages with the remainder of the district including hamlets being open countryside.
- 7.4 The application site is located in Ulceby. SP1 of the Local Plan does not list Ulceby in the settlement pattern, the supporting text explains that such locations fall within the fifth category of "open countryside", this includes hamlets and isolated groups of houses. These may have very limited facilities such as a church or a public house. There are also single dwellings and small isolated groups of houses in the district with no facilities.
- 7.5 The site lies within a group of houses that lie on Church Lane, close to the junction with the A1028. Further sporadic development is to the North further along Church Lane along with All Saints Church. There are minimal facilities in the hamlet, and it is isolated from other settlements. Access to larger service centres is only reasonably possible with the use of a private car, the fast-moving nearby roads do not allow for safe use by pedestrians and cyclist. The nearest settlement of any merit is Skendleby, a medium village 3km away accessed only by the A1028; settlements with facilities are further still at 5-6km (Alford and Partney). Due to the lack of services and facilities within Ulceby, residents are reliant on the larger settlements, however due to the sites isolated location, such settlements are not within walking or cycling distance. This would dictate that occupiers of the proposed dwelling would be

dependent on use of a private car for retail, education, health and social facilities and employment opportunities in the nearest settlements, it would increase reliance on non-sustainable modes of transport contrary to sustainability objectives in the Local Plan and one of the core planning principles in paragraph 108 and 109 the Framework which requires planning to "... opportunities to promote walking, cycling and public transport use are identified and pursued... actively manage patterns of growth in support of these objectives." The development therefore would be contrary to policies SP3 and SP4 which relate to the delivery of new homes within or adjacent to existing settlements identified under Policy SP1.

- 7.6 The applicant's agent, however, puts forward the assertion that, in this case, there are material considerations that outweigh the conflict with policy discussed above, and these should weigh in the planning balance. He specifically refers to paragraph 84 of the NPPF. Paragraph 82 of the NPPF further covers rural housing and requires it to be responsive to local circumstances. At para 84 it sets out the circumstances where isolated homes in the countryside may be supported as an exception to policy, the applicant has submitted their application on the basis of one of these exceptions. In order to be assessed against paragraph 84 the dwelling must first be accepted as being isolated. In this case, the site is part of the hamlet of Ulceby and is bordered by other dwellings.
- 7.7 Paragraph 84 is explicit in its reference to "isolated" dwellings, however neither the NPPF nor PPG provides a definition of 'isolated' to guide decision makers and guidance has been handed down through the Courts.
- 7.8 Braintree DC v SSCLG, Greyread Ltd & Granville Development Ltd [2018] EWCA, Civ 610, is of relevance, the Court of Appeal concluded that the word "isolated" simply connotes a dwelling that is physically separate or remote from a settlement. More recently, in City & Country Bramshill Ltd v Secretary of State for Housing, Communities and Local Government [2021] EWCA Civ 320 the Court held that "to adopt remoteness from other dwellings, instead of remoteness from a settlement, as the test for "isolated homes in the countryside" would seem inconsistent from the government's evident intention in producing the policy in paragraph 79" (now 84), namely to promote sustainable development in rural areas. It would prevent the policy applying to development on land next to other remote or sporadic rural housing on the basis that it would not be isolated, or even prevent it applying to a proposal for two or more dwellings because none of them would itself be isolated from another dwelling. Lord Justice Lindblom confirmed that to have 'remoteness' be related to other dwellings rather than to settlements would seem inconsistent with the intention of the policy in paragraph 79 (now 84).
- 7.9 The crucial test, according to the Bramshill House judgement, is whether the new buildings are remote from a settlement as opposed to other existing dwellings. Otherwise, Lord Lindblom said, 'the bar on development in the countryside would theoretically only bite if a single dwelling was proposed, away from any other single dwelling, as a

proposed group of new homes would be able to escape the test, because each of them would be close to other dwellings'. This, he judged, would be out of kilter with the government's intention in the NPPF.

- 7.10 Therefore, it is clear that sites can, as in this case, be next to other dwellings in the countryside for the exception to bite. What is slightly unclear, is whether the site can be part of a settlement. In this case, although the site is part of the settlement of Ulceby, crucially it is not a named settlement under Local Plan policy SP1-SP4. Hamlets such as this fall under the heading/category of "Open Countryside". Following on from Lord Lindblom, if sites next to other isolated dwellings can be considered, it should not be the case that if those other isolated dwellings form a hamlet then they cannot be considered. The site should not be 'penalised' just because it forms a small group. It would be illogical if a site could be considered as 'isolated' if bordered by 1 or 2 dwellings but not if bordered by a small group which constitutes a hamlet. Therefore, for the purposes of being 'isolated', it is considered that it means isolated from a named settlement in the Local Plan hierarchy of SP1. As such it could apply equally to being truly isolated, in terms of no near neighbours at all, as to part of a group or hamlet such as Ulceby. Having regard for this, the site is considered to be isolated in a para 84 sense.
- 7.11 Para 84 sets out that decisions should avoid the development of isolated homes in the countryside unless one or more of the following circumstances apply:
- a) there is an essential need for a rural worker, including those taking majority control of a farm business, to live permanently at or near their place of work in the countryside;
 - b) the development would represent the optimal viable use of a heritage asset or would be appropriate enabling development to secure the future of heritage assets;
 - c) the development would re-use redundant or disused buildings and enhance its immediate setting;
 - d) the development would involve the subdivision of an existing residential building; or
 - e) the design is of exceptional quality, in that it: - is truly outstanding, reflecting the highest standards in architecture, and would help to raise standards of design more generally in rural areas; and would significantly enhance its immediate setting, and be sensitive to the defining characteristics of the local area.
- 7.12 This application is not for a rural workers dwelling (a), it does not apply to the use of a heritage asset (b), nor does it reuse or subdivide a building (c and d). The applicant has put forward an argument that the design is of exceptional architectural quality and that the development would enhance its immediate setting (e). This is explored in the sections below.

Design quality

- 7.13 Policy SP10 of the Local Plan sets out the approach to design and states that the Council will support well designed sustainable development, particularly where the use of high quality materials are proposed and where the layout, scale, massing, height and density reflect the character of the surrounding area.
- 7.14 The design quality required by Paragraph 84(e) is significant and is a very high bar to meet, as established through numerous appeal decisions, nationally. The planning agent sets out that the proposal is of a design of exceptional quality which fully recognises, respects and enhances the fundamental characteristics of the rural setting in this part of the AONB, whilst also reflecting the highest standards in architecture, all with a view to raising the standards of design in the area in general. The proposal, however, has not followed the typical studied and orthodox route, there has been no design panel input, however the application is accompanied by a Design and Access Statement (DAS) within which the architect sets out their design rationale.
- 7.15 The layout comprises a detached roadside building used as a tractor store/garage. This being a single storey brick building fitted with a hipped roof. Moving further into the site, the proposed dwelling would lie centrally in a similar position as the barn to be demolished and would extend alongside The Lodge. It would be part single storey, rising to 2-storey further into the site, and would be arranged around a central courtyard. It would be constructed of red brick at ground floor with buff brick at first floor and the roof clad in clay pantiles.
- 7.16 The DAS sets out the inspirations behind the design, that being the traditional farmstead. It begins by setting out the key principles of the farmsteads layout, scale, form, massing and material construction and provides examples from nearby villages to create an architectural palette. It identifies the key characteristics of Lincolnshire vernacular as being symmetry and balance through positioning of openings, steeply pitched roofs, outbuildings, distinctive small windows, red brick details combined with limestone or timber elements. It goes on to identify local materials such as timber, limestone and clay, strong red and yellow brickwork.
- 7.17 While the DAS provides a good overview a traditional farmstead, this fails to fully follow through to the design of the proposal put forward. Moreover, the DAS does little to further explain or dissect the proposal in light of the previously identified key principles. While attempts are made to pick up on elements of the farmstead, there are clear contradictions between the key principles of the inspiration, as identified in the DAS, and the design of the proposal itself.
- 7.18 The symmetry and balance identified as key components to a traditional farmstead do not follow through to the design. The position of openings, particularly within the courtyard, do not offer a strong farmstead character, the character is further denuded with the arrangement of windows on the two-storey elements. The addition of balconies further

dilutes the character. Collectively, these elements weaken the farmstead character of the proposal, and undermine the design rationale.

- 7.19 The DAS justifies the position of openings in relation to how they benefit the internal flow of the building, and how the rooms and spaces work together, rather than focusing on the design rationale initially presented. Moreover, in the discussion of architectural details, the DAS states that these have been considered at the macro scale, such as the balcony setbacks and columns, and the micro scale, such as the brickwork detailing and fenestration, but fails to expand on the relevance of this. There is no rationalisation for these elements, no explanation as to how these feed into the traditional farmstead narrative. Indeed, it could be argued that the balconies do not. The DAS further discusses the use of feature bay windows in rural properties as the justification for the first floor oriel window. This again fails to relate back to the historic farmstead narrative and appears to be confusing rural dwellings and farmsteads. The use of terraces, balconies and colonnades is justified in the DAS by these having their routes in colonial architecture. Again, there is no connection to the historic farmstead narrative initially proposed as the design inspiration. Conversely it could be argued that this is a further architectural style being introduced, with no justification, which weakens the farmstead character of the proposal and undermines the design rationale. This arbitrary introduction of unrelated and unjustified architectural styles is again repeated with the description of the residential courtyards, the DAS explained that these draw their inspiration from European Villas and courtyards. The relevance of European Villas and courtyards or colonial architecture in a scheme which is seeking to offer a design of exceptional quality based on a traditional Lincolnshire farmstead is questionable.
- 7.20 The design and access statement discusses creating a narrative but this narrative is somewhat lost along the way in the design process. While there is no explicit requirement for proposals for exemplary dwellings to go through a Design Review Panel, such an approach helps the architect to explore the design in depth, dissecting the elements of the proposal and its justification, areas which are lacking here. In this case, it is apparent that the proposal lacks a clear narrative. The farmstead design rationale has the potential to work well at this site, in this rural location, historic farmsteads and their buildings make a fundamental contribution to the richly varied character of the English countryside. However, that put forward is diluted, and, in some areas, confused. The resulting design is not honest to the farmstead narrative. Due to the weaknesses in the scheme, the proposal does not meet the high standard expected for a dwelling under paragraph 84(e) of the NPPF. The energy efficiency efforts are applauded, however the use of solar gain, air source heat pumps and solar panels is not exemplary by today's standards.
- 7.21 Paragraph 84(e) specifically requires that the design be of exceptional quality, in that it is truly outstanding, reflecting the highest standards in architecture, and would help to raise standards of design more generally in rural areas. In this case, the proposal fails to meet that exceptional standard, the lack of a strong farmstead narrative carried through the

design and the medley of styles subtly introduced, does not result in an honest representation of a traditional Lincolnshire farmstead. The resulting design proposed, and justification put forwards, does not represent development of an exceptional quality, it is not truly outstanding, nor does it reflect the highest standards in architecture. The proposal therefore would not meet any of the circumstances set out in para 84 of the NPPF.

Impact on the immediate setting and the defining characteristics of the local area

- 7.22 Section 12 of the NPPF sets out the national approach to achieving good design through the planning system and states at paragraph 131 that 'good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, creates better places in which to live and work and helps make development acceptable to communities'.
- 7.23 Paragraph 135 of the NPPF goes on to state that developments should add to the overall quality of the area over the lifetime of the development and be visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and appropriate and effective landscaping. Criteria c of paragraph 135 also requires that developments are sympathetic to local character and history.
- 7.24 Paragraph 84(e) also requires that a proposal, to be supported, would significantly enhance its immediate setting, and be sensitive to the defining characteristics of the local area.
- 7.25 Policy SP10 of the Local Plan sets out the local approach to design, recognising that good design is important in shaping the places where we live, work and undertake leisure activities. The policy confirms that the Council will support well-designed sustainable development which maintains or enhances the local character.
- 7.26 Policy SP23 of the Local Plan considers landscape and states that 'the District's landscapes will be protected, enhanced, used and managed to provide an attractive and healthy working and living environment' and that 'development will be guided by the District's Landscape Character Assessment and landscapes defined as highly sensitive will be afforded the greatest protection'.
- 7.27 Criteria 3 of Policy SP23 goes on to state that 'the Council will ensure that the distinctive character of the District's landscapes whether they are of cultural, natural or historic significance, will not be compromised. In particular, the highest level of protection will be given to the Lincolnshire Wolds Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, which is designated at a national level because of its landscape quality'. The importance of the AONB is recognised in the Levelling-up and Regeneration Act 2023.
- 7.28 The East Lindsey Landscape Character Assessment 2009 (LCA) identifies the site in Landscape Character Area as Wolds Farmland, specifically the

Little Cawthorpe to Skendleby Wolds Farmland; it is an area considered to be moderate to high in terms of sensitivity. The LCA identifies the key characteristics of the area as being an elevated rolling agricultural landscape with a mix of arable farmland, pasture and woodland which frames views. It is a distinctly rural and peaceful landscape characterised by rolling farmland and wooded valleys with spring line settlements. The LCA states that any development within the area should be carefully designed to respect the small scale localised distinctiveness within this character area. It should also respect the rural character, the small scale of villages, the local architecture, the pattern of the agricultural fields and the trees within the woodland and valley features. Positioning of any future developments should use the existing screening elements, which are characteristic to the area and their location should be concentrated around existing settlements to prevent loss of the rural landscape. Development on hill tops and along the skylines should also be avoided.

- 7.29 The site lies within a cluster of dwellings within Ulceby. Views of the site are gained when moving along Church Lane and the proposal would be seen within the context of the cluster of houses which make up the hamlet. The proposed dwelling has been designed to integrate into the row of dwellings, with supplementary landscaping proposed to the front and rear. This would aim to soften the rural edge of the site. The dwelling would always be seen in the context of the hamlet setting from the public vantage points. Additional boundary planting and tree planting would also ensure the integration of the proposal into the rural setting appropriately.
- 7.30 A visual tree assessment has been submitted which recommends the removal of 3 ash trees along the front boundary, there are currently 5 mature trees along this boundary, 2 of which are subject to Tree Preservation Orders. However the applicants agent has confirmed that it is now the intention to retain all 5 trees as per the submitted plans. The Councils Street Scene department raised concern with the report and advised that the trees should be retained. The trees currently help to assimilate the site into its surroundings, the tree lined appearance of this part of Church Lane is a key part of its character. The retention of the trees could, and should, be ensured by condition.
- 7.31 A Preliminary Ecology Report and a Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment (both prepared by JM Ecology) have been submitted in support of the application. The Preliminary Ecological Appraisal identifies that the remaining on-site habitats are little floristic value and their losses are not considered a major constraint. It makes recommendations for ecological enhancements include native tree planting, native rich species rich hedgerows or shrub planting, native wildflower area and additional features such as bird, bat and hedgehog boxes. It also sets out recommendations for clearing scrub or grassland to protect herptiles, as well as measures to ensure the protection of badgers, bats, bird and hedgehogs. Ecological enhancements are designed into the landscaping scheme and the BNG assessment sets out that based on the proposed landscaping, the scheme is to result in significant BNG. It would result in an overall net change of 147.15% for area habitats as well as 55.14%

for hedgerow habitats. Overall, these enhancements would help to integrate the proposal into the site in an appropriate way, whilst limiting the impact on the immediate setting and the defining characteristics of the local area.

Impact on the setting of listed buildings

- 7.32 Policy SP11 focuses on the districts heritage assets. It seeks to secure the continued protection and enhancement of heritage assets in East Lindsey. It states that proposals will be supported where they (amongst other matters) preserve or enhance heritage assets and their setting. The setting of a listed building is defined as the surroundings in which a heritage asset is experienced.
- 7.33 150m to the north-west of the site is The Peacocks, a grade II listed building, and 260m north is the Church of All Saints, also grade II listed. Between the site and the listed buildings there are a number of buildings and trees. Having regard for these intervening features, it is considered that proposal would not result in harm to the setting of the listed buildings.

Impact on neighbour amenity

- 7.34 Policy SP10 of the Local Plan states that development will be supported if it does not, amongst other matters, unacceptably harm any nearby residential amenity. Paragraph 135 of the NPPF states that developments should ensure a high standard of amenity for existing and future occupants.
- 7.35 The site lies between two dwellings, Braewater House, a two-storey dwelling, is to the south, and The Lodge, a bungalow, to the north. The applicant owns Braewater House. Church Lane runs along the west side of the site and agricultural land is to the rear (east). On the opposite side of Church Lane there is a row of terrace dwellings.
- 7.36 The proposed dwelling would run alongside and forward of The Lodge, with the most forward section being single storey. It would lie to the south of this neighbour and be close to the shared boundary. The building would be quite imposing given its size and proximity to this neighbour, but having regard for the existing building on the site which is to be demolished and bearing in mind the general openness around The Lodge, it is unlikely the development would result in a harmful overbearing impact on this neighbour. While the development would result in some overshadowing, it would not be particularly more harmful than shadowing caused by the existing barn. Two first floor windows are proposed which would face towards The Lodge, these would serve a bathroom and a hallway, overlooking could be presented through the use of obscure glazing which could be ensured by condition. The balcony to the east elevation is shown to have a solid screen on the northern end which would prevent direct overlooking of the lodge. The proposed garage would sit towards the front of the site, given its size and position, it would not result in harm to The Lodge.

- 7.37 Braewater House, to the south, is owned by the applicant. Due to the 'U' shape of the dwelling, parts would be 4.5m from the boundary with this neighbouring dwelling and parts would be 16.5m from that boundary. The proposed dwelling would extend partly alongside Braewater House and partly beyond the rear. Landscaping is shown along this boundary. Having regard for the separation distances and landscaping, it is considered that the proposal would not result in harm to the amenities of Braewater House by way of an overbearing impact. Windows are generally positioned at a reasonable distance from Braewater House, and the landscaping would help, however the location of balcony 2 would allow for overlooking of the garden of Braewater House, equally parts of balcony 2 would too. However, bearing in mind the proposed landscaping, which would help to some degree, and given that the applicant owns Braewater House, this is not considered to be harmful enough to warrant refusal of the application. The proposed garage would sit towards the front of the site, adjacent to a garage at Braewater House. Given its size and position, it would not result in harm to amenity.
- 7.38 Neighbours opposite the site are separated from the site by the road, the degree of separation would ensure the development would not harm their amenities.

8.0 CONCLUSION

- 8.1 The application site lies in the open countryside and not within a settlement identified by SP1 of the Local Plan. It lies within a cluster of houses which make up the hamlet of Ulceby, there are no easily accessible services and it is isolated from other settlements of merit. Access to larger service centres is only reasonably possible with the use of a private car, the fast moving nearby roads do not allow for safe use by pedestrians and cyclist. This would dictate that occupiers of the proposed dwelling would be dependent on use of a private car. The development of a dwelling at the site, therefore, would increase reliance on non-sustainable modes of transport contrary to sustainability objectives in the Local Plan and one of the core planning principles in paragraph 108 and 109 the Framework which requires planning to "... opportunities to promote walking, cycling and public transport use are identified and pursued... actively manage patterns of growth in support of these objectives." The development therefore would be contrary to policies SP3 and SP4 of the Local Plan which relate to the delivery of new homes within or adjacent to existing settlements identified under Policy SP1.
- 8.2 Para 84 of the NPPF sets out the circumstances where exceptions to the policy to avoid the development of isolated homes in the countryside apply. The applicant has sought to meet the design quality required by para 84(e), that being development where the design is of exceptional quality, in that it is truly outstanding, reflecting the highest standards in architecture, and would help to

raise standards of design more generally in rural areas and would significantly enhance its immediate setting, and be sensitive to the defining characteristics of the local area.

- 8.3 The development proposed attempts to put forward a design based on the traditional Lincolnshire Farmstead. It sets out a comprehensive assessment of the components of this, however this fails to run true through the proposed development. The proposal lacks a strong farmstead narrative through its design and subtly introduces a medley of other styles, which conflicts with the original design ethos. As a result, this does not result in an honest representation of a traditional Lincolnshire farmstead. Accordingly, the resulting design proposed, and justification put forwards, does not represent development of an exceptional quality, it is not truly outstanding nor does it reflect the highest standards in architecture. While the proposal does offer enhancements to the setting, this alone is not adequate to meet subsection e of para 84. The proposal therefore would not meet any of the circumstances set out in para 84 of the NPPF.
- 8.4 This conclusion has been arrived at having taken into account all other relevant material considerations, none of which outweigh the reasons for the officer recommendation made below.

10.0 OFFICER RECOMMENDATION

10.1 Recommended for refusal

RECOMMENDATION: REFUSAL

subject to the following conditions:

- 1 The housing strategy set out in SP3 and SP4 of the East Lindsey Local Plan seeks to direct new housing development to the more sustainable towns and villages as identified by SP1. The proposal seeks planning permission for the erection of a dwelling in an open countryside location, outside of any sustainable settlement and is therefore contrary to the strategic objectives of those policies. Paragraph 84 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) sets out the exceptional circumstances where housing in the countryside may be permitted. The proposed development, as a result of its design and justification, does not represent development of an exceptional quality, it is not truly outstanding, nor does it reflect the highest standards in architecture as required by paragraph 84 of the NPPF. The proposal would not meet any of the circumstances set out in para 84 of the National Planning Policy Framework and would be in conflict with SP1, SP3 and SP4 of the East Lindsey Local Plan.