



---

# Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 January 2022

**by Paul Cooper MSc MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17 February 2022

---

## Appeal Ref: APP/N2535/W/21/3267268

**Sunnyside Up Farm Shop, Poplar Farm, Tealby Road, Market Rasen,  
Lincolnshire LN8 3UL**

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
  - The appeal is made by Mr John Casswell against the decision of West Lindsey District Council.
  - The application Ref 140707, dated 26 February 2020, was refused by notice dated 23 July 2020.
  - The development proposed is Change of Use of land for siting of caravans (lodges), proposed recreation pond with 20 fishing pegs including site levelling using excavated material.
- 

## Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

## Main Issue

2. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the development on the setting of the countryside, the Area of Great Landscape Value (GLV) and the Lincolnshire Wolds Area of Natural Beauty (AONB)

## Reasons

3. The appeal site is located approximately 2.5km north-east of Market Rasen and is part of the wider Poplar Farm site, which stretches to above 37 hectares in overall size. The appeal site is adjacent to a site granted permission for a pond and the siting of caravans in 2019 and the since this refusal at planning application stage, the appeal site has since been approved for a smaller scheme than the proposals in front of me.
4. The site is located within a GLV and also approximately 2.5km from an AONB. It is allocated as a countryside (Tier 8) designation as a set out in Policy LP2 of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan (2017) (the LP) which sets out a number of criteria of restriction for development.
5. Policy LP7 is relevant here and it deals with a sustainable visitor economy and again sets out a number of criteria that proposals should look to adhere to. Whilst there is no doubt that a) and b) would be met, I find that the scale of the proposals are contrary to criterion c) and d) in that they do not respect the natural and built environment qualities of the area and are not appropriate for the character of the local environment in terms of scale and nature. I consider that the proposals for 50 units go over and above the context and character of the countryside location in this instance.

6. The same context also renders the proposals contrary to Policy LP17, which seeks to protect and enhance the intrinsic value of landscapes and townscapes. The size and scale of the proposals would adversely affect the countryside setting of the locality, and the setting of the GLV would be impacted incorporating the visual and countryside benefits of the GLV.
7. Given the distance to the AONB, I am satisfied that the proposals would not have a negative impact on the setting of the AONB, nevertheless this does not overcome the material harm that I have identified to the GLV and the rural character of the area from the scale of the works proposed.

### **Other Matters**

8. There are factors in favour of the proposals in that it would undoubtedly contribute to the tourism industry and be beneficial to the economy. However, I find that these benefits do not outweigh the material harm to the GLV and the wider countryside echoed from the conflict with local policies LP7 and LP17 and as such, the proposals are dismissed in their current form set out in this specific application.
9. There has been a large amount of representation with regards to the proposals, both in favour and against and I am satisfied that those representations had been taken into consideration when the Council have made their decision. I note that the opinion of Officers was over-ruled when this was heard at Committee, but I have found that the Committee decision was well-founded to highlight concerns with regard to the scale of the appeal proposals and the effect on the wider countryside and the GLV.

### **Conclusion**

10. Therefore, for the reasons given above, and taking into account all other matters, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

*Paul Cooper*

INSPECTOR