



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 December 2020

by Thomas Hatfield BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21st January 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/L3245/W/20/3259261

Land north of Boulangerie, Oretton, DY14 0UH

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant outline planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Paul Hulland against the decision of Shropshire Council.
 - The application Ref 20/01535/OUT, dated 9 April 2020, was refused by notice dated 6 August 2020.
 - The development proposed is outline application for residential development of up to five dwellings with detached garaging, to include access.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The description of development given above is taken from the Decision Notice. This reflects amendments that were made to the scheme at application stage and the application was determined on this basis.
3. The application is in outline with all matters reserved for future consideration except for the means of access. Drawings showing an indicative layout of the development were submitted with the application, and I have had regard to these in determining this appeal.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is whether the appeal site would accord with the locational requirements of local policy for residential development.

Reasons

5. The appeal site is within the village of Oretton, which is a small dispersed settlement surrounded by open countryside. It contains limited services and facilities and is some distance from the nearest settlement of any size.
6. Oretton, Farlow and Hill Houses is identified as a Community Cluster under Policies MD1 and S6 of the Shropshire Site Allocations and Management of Development ('SAMDev') Plan (2015). In this regard, Policy S6 states that limited infilling of small, market priced houses on single plots may be acceptable on suitable sites. A housing guideline of around 12 dwellings is set for this area over the plan period to 2026, and the Council states that 10 dwellings have already been built or granted planning permission.

7. The appeal site consists of a paddock of around 0.4 hectares in size that is adjacent to existing properties on 2 sides. It has road frontages to both the north east and the south and abuts open fields to the south west. Whilst the site is relatively well contained by existing properties, it is a large piece of land in relation to the size of the village. In this regard, the number of dwellings proposed is somewhat misleading as these would consist of low density properties served by a new access road. Given its size, the site would not comprise limited infilling in my view. However, in coming to that view I have attached little weight to the definition of 'limited infilling' set out in the emerging Shropshire Local Plan Review, which is at a relatively early stage of preparation.
8. Policy S6 of the SAMDev Plan also states that new development should be of 'single plots'. This wording is clearly intended to restrict new developments in this area to single dwellings only, in order to reflect the size and character of the village. In this regard, I do not accept the contention that it is simply a requirement for new properties to be located within individual plots. I further note that my colleague who determined a recent appeal¹ in Oreton took a similar interpretation of this policy wording. Given that the development proposes multiple plots, it is clearly contrary to this requirement.
9. I further note that the development would result in the settlement housing guideline of 12 dwellings being exceeded, with more than 5 years of the plan period still to run. Whilst this exceedance would be relatively modest, and not sufficient to justify refusal by itself, it adds to the weight against the proposal.
10. Separately, as the site is located between existing properties on either side, any harm to the surrounding landscape would be limited. However, that does not alter my other concerns regarding the development, as set out above.
11. For the above reasons, I conclude that the appeal site would not accord with the locational requirements of local policy for residential development. The development is contrary to Policy S6 of the SAMDev Plan (2015) in this regard.

Conclusion

12. As set out above, I conclude that the appeal site is not in a suitable location for new housing having regard to local policy for this area. Whilst the development would provide 5 new dwellings, and would generate economic benefits through the creation of employment and the purchasing of materials and furnishings, that does not alter my view that the appeal should be dismissed.

Thomas Hatfield

INSPECTOR

¹ APP/L3245/W/20/3246734