



## **Additional Appeal Decisions Supporting HVA Objection**

These appeal decisions are submitted in further support of Holybourne Village Association's objection to Planning Application EHDC/25/0748/OUT. They should be read in addition to the following appeals, which have previously been submitted:

- APP/A2335/W/23/3326750 – Morecambe, Lancashire – Scheme dismissed due to impact on setting of the Torrisholme Barrow Scheduled Monument
- APP/D3125/W/23/3332089 – Ascott under Wychwood, Oxfordshire – Scheme dismissed due to heritage and landscape impacts.
- APP/U1430/W/21/3283287 – Fairlight Cove, East Sussex – Scheme dismissed due to risk of ground water flooding which was not justified through a Sequential test.
- APP/A2335/W/24/3345416 - Bailragg Lane, Lancaster – Scheme dismissed due to risk of fluvial, surface and ground water flooding which was not justified through a Sequential test.
- APP/H1840/W/23/3320041 – Tibberton, Wychavon District Council – Scheme dismissed due to irreversible harm to local character, poor infrastructure alignment, and conflict with planning strategy - despite housing need.
- APP/X1545/W/24/3351697 – Southminster, Maldon District Council - Despite significant public benefits, the landscape harm was so substantial that it outweighed the benefits.

### **Bushey Appeal Decision – Ref APP/N1920/W/23/3314268**

The Bushey appeal was dismissed despite a severe housing shortfall (1.23–2.25 years), due to failure to apply the Sequential Test and significant harm to the Green Belt and landscape. The Inspector concluded that NPPF Paragraph 11d(i) provided a clear reason for refusal. This decision reinforces the weight attributed to steering development away from areas at risk of flooding and to designated assets (such as Green Belt, vis a vis Local Green Space) under the NPPF.

### **Aston Clinton Appeal Decision – Ref APP/J0405/W/24/3342894**

The Aston Clinton appeal was dismissed due to conflict with the spatial strategy and moderate landscape harm, despite a housing shortfall. The Inspector found that development outside the settlement boundary of a “larger village” was inappropriate and that landscape harm outweighed the public benefits. This supports HVA's position regarding Holybourne's classification and landscape sensitivity.

### **Wormegay Appeal Decision – Ref APP/V2635/W/24/3351873**

The Wormegay appeal was dismissed due to less than substantial harm to the setting of a Scheduled Monument (Motte and Bailey Castle). The Inspector found that the solar



farm would erode the monument's open, undeveloped rural setting and diminish its significance. Despite strong public benefits from renewable energy, the appeal was refused under NPPF Paragraph 11d(i). This decision supports HVA's objection regarding harm to the setting of the Cuckoo's Corner Roman Settlement.

#### **Wyboston Appeal Decision – Ref APP/K0235/W/24/3353144**

The appeal was dismissed due to harm to the setting of a Scheduled Monument and failure to apply the Sequential Test for flood risk. The Inspector found the heritage harm to be at the higher end of “less than substantial” and concluded that public benefits did not outweigh it. Like Holybourne, Wyboston sits adjacent to a larger settlement—St Neots—yet the Inspector found the site unsustainable, noting that walking or cycling to services would be inconvenient and that residents would likely rely on private cars. This conflicted with Local Plan policies promoting sustainable access. The decision supports HVA's objections on heritage, flood risk, and unsustainable location grounds.

#### **Thakeham Appeal Decision – Ref APP/Z3825/W/24/3350094**

The Thakeham appeal was dismissed due to conflict with the spatial strategy, unsustainable location, and failure of the Sequential Test. The Inspector found that the scale of development was inappropriate for a small village and that proposed transport improvements would not mitigate reliance on private cars. The Sequential Test was found to be flawed, with sequentially preferable sites identified. This decision supports HVA's objections regarding Holybourne's classification, flood risk, and unsustainable development.

#### **Sale Appeal Decision – Ref APP/Q4245/W/21/3289557**

The Sale appeal was dismissed due to harm to the character and openness of a designated Protected Open Space, despite significant sports and community benefits. The Inspector found that the loss of informal recreational value and visual amenity outweighed the benefits. This supports HVA's objection regarding the loss of Holybourne Play Area, a designated Local Green Space.

#### **Sherfield on Loddon Appeal Decision – Ref APP/H1705/W/19/3226286**

The Sherfield on Loddon appeal was dismissed due to less than substantial harm to a Scheduled Monument, a Grade II listed building, and a Conservation Area. The Inspector gave very considerable weight to heritage harm and concluded that even a significant housing shortfall did not justify the development. This decision directly supports HVA's heritage objections and the application of NPPF Paragraph 11d(i).

#### **Holybourne Appeal Decision – Ref APP/M1710/W/23/3332373**

The Holybourne appeal was dismissed due to less than substantial harm to the setting of the Grade II\* listed Holy Rood Church and the character and appearance of the Holybourne Conservation Area. The Inspector found that the proposed development would sever the historic linkage between the churchyard and the stream corridor,



introducing a suburban form of development that compromised the rural village aesthetic. Despite the Council's lack of a five-year housing land supply, the Inspector concluded that NPPF Paragraph 11d(i) was engaged due to heritage harm, and the appeal was dismissed. This decision directly supports HVA's objection regarding harm to designated heritage assets in Holybourne.

### **Burghclere Appeal Decision – Ref APP/B9506/W/21/3278451**

The Burghclere appeal was dismissed due to conflict with the emerging Burghclere Neighbourhood Plan, spatial strategy, and significant landscape harm. The Inspector found that the proposal would undermine the neighbourhood planning process, prejudice the outcome of the referendum, and diminish community confidence. The site lay outside the settlement boundary and was not identified for development. Despite a housing shortfall, the Inspector concluded that the adverse impacts significantly and demonstrably outweighed the benefits, and therefore the tilted balance under NPPF Paragraph 11d did not justify approval. This decision strongly supports HVA's objection regarding conflict with the Alton Neighbourhood Plan, inappropriate scale of development in Holybourne, and landscape harm.