

APPEAL BY MR B MCNULTY AGAINST THE DECISION OF THE COUNCIL TO REFUSE PLANNING PERMISSION FOR INTERNAL ALTERATIONS TO THE DAIRY HOUSE, HUNGERFORD LANE, MADELEY, TO FORM TWO SEPARATE DWELLINGS

| | |
|---------------------------------------|---|
| <u>Application Number</u> | 15/00155/FUL |
| <u>LPA's Decision</u> | Refused by delegated authority on 27th April 2015 |
| <u>Appeal Decision</u> | Dismissed |
| <u>Date of Appeal Decision</u> | 23rd December 2015 |

The Inspector considered the main issue to be whether the proposal comprises a sustainable form of development, taking into account policy in the National Planning Policy Framework.

In dismissing the appeal the Inspector made the following comments:

- Planning permission was approved in 2010 to convert the original appeal building (Hungerford House) into two dwellings. This followed two refusals of planning permission (one in 2008 and one in 2009) to convert the original appeal building into three dwellings. In approving the conversion to two dwellings, the Council acknowledged that the site was in an isolated location, but considered that this was outweighed by *"finding a new use for a sizeable and attractive rural building"*.
- The Inspector stated that in view of the Council's lack of a five year housing land supply the appeal should be considered against the housing policies in the NPPF.
- The proposal would seek to make use of a permanent and substantially constructed building, and would not conflict with any of the purposes of the Green Belt. The proposal would constitute an appropriate form of development in Green Belt.
- Notwithstanding this, the appeal site falls within the countryside, and consequently needs to be assessed against Paragraph 55 of the NPPF. The site would be approximately 1.5 km from Madeley, where there are shops, services and public transport facilities to meet day to day needs. However, the long route to Madeley includes Hungerford Lane which is narrow, has no pavements and is unlit. This would mean heavy reliance on car transport, rather than the bicycle or foot, which would run contrary to sustainability aims in the NPPF.
- In respect of paragraph 55, the two dwellings are in an isolated countryside location, and they would do very little to contribute towards the enhancement or maintenance of the rural community. Furthermore, the proposal would not meet any of the listed "special circumstances" in Paragraph 55. Although the appellant asserts that in 2013 there was no interest in occupying the larger and consented dwelling, no details of historic and current marketing activity were provided and there was no evidence submitted to suggest that the proposal would make improvements to the immediate setting of the area.
- Consideration must be given to all three mutually dependent dimensions of sustainability in the NPPF, namely the economic, social and environmental roles. Any economic contribution would be outweighed by the harm caused as a result of the reliance on the private motor vehicle. Whilst the proposal would make a contribution to the housing need of the Borough, the contribution from a net increase of one dwelling would be minimal, and would not outweigh the conclusion that the proposal would constitute an unsustainable form of development contrary to the sustainability aims of the NPPF.

Recommendation

That the decision be noted.