

DESIGN AND MANAGEMENT.co.uk

7 WEST FEN, FRITHVILLE, BOSTON. LINC'S. PE22 7EX TEL 01205 750775

Addendum Statement Ref Resubmission of Application No B/21/0161 Land Adjacent Holly Cottage, Station Road, Old Leake Commonsides PE22 9QJ Refused on 21st June 2021.

Statement

The Application the subject of this resubmission, numbered and refused permission as cited above was refused for the following two reasons.

1. The proposal would create a new dwelling in an unsustainable countryside location within Flood Zone 3. A new dwelling in this location has not been demonstrated as being necessary, and in the absence of an appropriate justification, the principle of development in this location is not accepted. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy 1 and Policy 4 of the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan, and contrary to the principles of sustainable development as advocated by the National Planning Policy Framework.

2. The proposed dwelling by virtue of its siting, scale and resultant impact would not reinforce the local context in terms of development largely parallel or perpendicular to the highway. Despite a nearby dwelling which follows a neighbouring boundary line to the west of the site, the dwelling is sited at odds with the neighbouring property directly adjacent and the protruding outbuilding emphasises this incongruent relationship. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy 2 and Policy 3 of the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan, and contrary to paragraph 127 of the National Planning Policy Framework and C1 of the National Design Guide.

The Decision Notice includes that:-

In determining this application the authority has taken account of the guidance in paragraph 38 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2019 in order to seek to secure sustainable development that improves the economic, social and environmental conditions of the Borough.

It should be noted that the SELLP requires under “Section 5. Quality Housing for All, at 5.1.3 This Local Plan aims to establish a more balanced market and create a better range and mix of housing opportunities in a range of locations. The South East Lincolnshire authorities will work proactively with owners and developers of these sites to ensure that they become places of choice for people to live, and that they contribute to a change in the image of South East Lincolnshire’s housing market.”

No conversation or correspondence occurred or ensued between the applicant and the BBC, the application was summarily refused without.

In respect Reasons for Refusal, the second (2) is resolved by reorientation of the proposed in the resubmission, which leaves only the first (1) to be addressed. I will address that by this.

I note that amongst other insinuation and error, including by various deliberate omission the Officer Report is “economical with actualité” at the very least.

The Officer Report begins by referencing an Application (B/20/0147) and Appeal Decision (Appeal Ref: APP/Z2505/W/20/3262366 Land adjacent Laconia, Church Road, Freiston, Boston, PE22 0NX.) of no relevance or synergy whatsoever to as is/was proposed by B/21/0161.

For instance it then resorts to “No information has been provided to demonstrate that the proposed dwelling in a countryside location is required to meet the sustainable development needs of the area, in terms of economic, community or environmental benefits.” But self evidently from the plans and application, the application includes an explanation in respect of the considerable environmental benefit which is key to the application location and intent.

Regards Flood Risk EA statutory consultee comment is excluded (and now deleted, (it appears) from the website application page) The singular consideration within the report in respect of the Site Specific FRA included with the application is to critique the NPPF references as superseded paragraph numbers. Disingenuously knowing full well of course that only the paragraph numbers and not the Guidance or Material Considerations had change

The Officer Report refers to NPPF Para 79, in particular as is contained in that para regards it's definition of what isolated could perhaps be permitted, then conflating that because it not actually isolated para 79 somehow could still be applied to what's not isolated. The proposed is not isolated, referring to Braintree v others [2017] EWHC 2743 (Admin) that just so obviously cannot be so, which makes Para 79 entirely and wholly irrelevant of any consideration at all.

Please assess this submission in its entirety without reference or reliance on the previous.

The foregoing are just a few errors and perversities of the Officer Report, they are not by any means all.

To be clear the application is for a dwelling and nature reserve immediately adjacent a large group of dwelling in a sustainable location unique for the purposes proposed.

It is necessary for the site to be permanently occupied to protect the reserve from interference, although a private reserve is intended it is proposed that it will be open for local naturalists and Schools to engage with, including planting, sculpting and setting it up. The applicants will of course be happy to accept conditions in respect of guaranteeing the reserve.

Regards Exception Test / Sequential Test the proposed location is necessary because no other suitable could be identified and although there may be minimal risk of flooding the geography of the site is more or less unique and crucially is necessary to be utilised for the reserve, but can and will be mitigated to ensure the dwelling is safe and not at risk of being flooded.

If anything additional is required or any question arises please just email or telephone.

Keith Baker Feb 2022