

Ms Jane Slaymaker  
Parish Clerk to  
Bolingbroke (inc Hareby) Parish Council  
4 Church Lane  
Hundleby  
Spilsby  
PE23 5NA

Dear Jayne

**Re: The Black Horse Inn, Moat Lane Old Bolingbroke. Spilsby, Lincs**

I refer to my previous letter dated 29<sup>th</sup> February 2024 concerning the nomination received on the above property under The Localism Act 2011, for inclusion on the Assets of Community Value list.

After careful consideration of the nomination, I advise that the above property will **NOT** be listed on the Assets of Community Value.

When making this decision the following factors have been considered

The first test under Section 88 (1) of the act is.

- (a) *There must be an actual current use of the building or other land that is not ancillary use, and which furthers the social well-being or social interests of the local community.*
- (b) *It must be realistic to think that there can continue to be a non-ancillary use of the building or land which will further the social well-being or social interests of the local community.*

Having read all representations the panel was not persuaded that the nomination provides any evidence of any present usage of the premises to provide cultural recreational or sporting interests activities. This was confirmed by written representation from the current owner. Whilst there is some information in the councils' local plan that people would like to see the provision of a public house again there is no definite supporting information of the activities that the listing of this asset this would facilitate. Very limited and unsupported information was provided of historic use of the premises, but no evidence of continuing activities was provided by the applicant. There is a village hall at the location, and this could facilitate such activities both now and in the future but no information was provided in the application that gave any clarity on this matter. As such the first test was not met.

The second test under Section 88 (2) of the act is

- (a) *There is a time in the recent past when an actual use of the building or other land that is not ancillary use, and which furthers the social well-being or social interests of the local community.*
- (b) *It is realistic to think that there is a time in the next five years when there could be non-ancillary use of the building or other land that would further (whether or not in the same way as before) the social well-being or social interests of the community.*

It would appear from all documentation submitted that there has been no clear evidenced use of this premises as a public house since 2012. We thought it would be entirely appropriate to use a period of time of five years as recent past in this particular determination. We are comfortable that's on this particular occasion five years is appropriate however we did also consider what would happen to application if we were to double the recent past time to ten years. Again, from the information supplied there was no evidenced use of the premises that could be considered to support this application. On that basis this test was determined to have failed.

If you have any further questions, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Yours sincerely



Duncan Hollingworth

Service Manager (Buildings and Property)