



Appeal Decision

APPENDIX 4

Site visit made on 30 April 2007

by **D L Burrows** DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State
for Communities and Local Government

Bristol BS1 6PN

☎ 0117 372 6372
email:enquiries@pins.gsi.gov.uk

Date: 3 May 2007

Appeal Ref: APP/V3120/A/06/2032405

Land at Hillview, Shrivenham Road, Longcot SN7 7TP

- 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 and Mrs David Ridgway against the decision of Vale of White Horse District Council.
- The application Ref LON/16205/6-X, dated 14 July 2006, was refused by notice dated 22 August 2006.
- The development proposed is an outline application for the erection of one dwelling.

Decision

1. I dismiss the appeal.

Reasons

2. The application is made in outline with details of access provided at this time for consideration. The application was accompanied by a plan showing a potential layout for the site, but it is clear that this was submitted for illustrative purposes only. I shall proceed on that basis.
3. The village limits of Longcot are not defined and whether the site is within the settlement is a fundamental difference between the parties.
4. The appeal site is an undeveloped, apparently greenfield site to the rear of properties on Church Close and a short informal cul-de-sac which serves 5 properties. Wayside and Fernley front Shrivenham Road, behind Wayside is Holly Tree Cottage (Rose Cottage on the site plan) and adjacent to the appeal site are two new houses, Meadow View and Field House. These properties form a small cluster of development between Church Close and the King and Queen PH with the large new dwelling behind it.
5. Access to the site would be from the cul-de-sac via an existing field gate. At present it is only hard surfaced as far as Wayside and Fernley. Where it serves Field House and Meadow View it is made up of loose chippings and has the appearance of a private drive. To my mind the combination of the location/design of the two new dwellings and their access give a firm and easily identified edge to the built up area of the village. The hedges and vegetation around the site may preclude views of it from the wider countryside, but it is not uncommon for such land to be found on the periphery of settlements such as Longcot. It in the past the land may have been associated with residential use, but those properties have now been demolished and it has no obvious

relationship with the current adjacent properties. As such I consider the site can be properly regarded as part of the wider countryside rather than within the limits of the settlement.

6. Policy GS2 of the adopted Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2011 says that outside the built-up areas new building will not be permitted unless it is on land which has been identified for development in the local plan. The site is not identified for development purposes therefore residential use would result in an encroachment of built development into the countryside which would harm its open, undeveloped character and be contrary to local plan objectives.
7. I appreciate that a previous inspector in 2001 found that the site itself did not contribute materially to the rural setting of the village, but the site under consideration at that time was different, new development has taken place since then and a new local plan has been adopted. Neither in his decision does the inspector make any reference to a policy the equivalent of GS2.
8. I have taken account of all the other matters raised but find that none are sufficient to overcome the objections I have identified to the development.

D L Burrows

INSPECTOR