



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 October 2018

by D Guiver LLB (Hons) Solicitor

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20 November 2018

Appeal Ref: APP/N2535/W/18/3206655

23 Barton Street, Keelby, Grimsby DN41 8EP

- 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 Ms Calaby against the decision of West Lindsey District Council.
 - The application Ref 136910, dated 16 October 2017, was refused by notice dated 8 January 2018.
 - The development proposed is mixed development of holiday lodges and work-space building.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The application is made in outline with landscaping reserved for future consideration. Drawings submitted with the application showing landscaping details are therefore merely illustrative in relation to the reserved matter and I have determined this appeal accordingly.
3. Since the date of the Council's decision, the National Planning Policy Framework 2018 (the Framework) has been published and has effect. The parties have had the opportunity to make representations on the effect of the Framework on the application and I have taken all comments into consideration in this decision.
4. The appellant states that the application is essentially a resubmission of an earlier proposal but that the Council has given new reasons for refusal. The original application is not before me and I must determine this appeal on its own merits. However, I note that between the determination of the first scheme and the issue of the current application the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan 2017 came into force and this now comprises the local development plan. Accordingly, I must also determine the current application in relation to the current plan.

Main Issues

5. The main issues are;
 - a) whether the proposal is in an appropriate location with regard to local development plan policies; and
 - b) the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

6. The proposal is for a mixed development of holiday lodges and a small office complex. The proposed buildings would be single-storey structures, clad in timber with roofing either slate tiles (for the lodges) or aluminium sheet (for the offices). Final landscaping is a reserved matter but the application plans do refer to the retention of some existing trees and identify existing hedges though without stating the extent to which they might be retained.

Location

7. The appeal site comprises an open field surrounded on three sides by a hedge and currently in agricultural use (though it appears to be left fallow). The site lies outside the footprint of the nearest settlement at Keelby and is therefore within the open countryside. The area surrounding the site is also predominantly in agricultural use although the busy A18 runs in front of the site. On the opposite side of the A18 there is a vehicle sales business and beyond that lies the main built form of Keelby. There are a few outlying houses fronting the A18.

Holiday Lodges

8. Tourism is a major United Kingdom industry that generates a significant income and makes a major contribution to the national and local economies. There is evidence of a growth in tourism leading to increased demand for accommodation in Lincolnshire. However, the evidence before me does not demonstrate a specific need for accommodation in the location of the appeal site. Even if such a need could be shown there is no compelling evidence to show why such accommodation could not be located within the settlement boundary of the nearby village of Keelby rather than in the open countryside. While I accept that accommodation at the appeal site could provide a base from which tourists could travel to a number of attractions in Lincolnshire, the same would be true of accommodation in any number of other locations.
9. The proposed development is relatively small in size so would provide limited support for local services in Keelby and there is little evidence to demonstrate that such services are under threat and would therefore require support. Again, even if there was evidence of a threat to facilities in Keelby, development within the settlement footprint would be at least as effective in providing the necessary support.
10. Therefore the proposed development would not accord with Policies LP2, LP7 and LP55 of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan 2017 (the Local Plan) which seek to limit new development in the countryside to that which is demonstrably essential to the effective operation of outdoor recreation and accommodation necessary for agriculture, horticulture or forestry.

Employment Site

11. The appellant states that the proposed development would allow small businesses to have access to office space without having to travel to larger settlements. There is clearly a need for rural employment opportunities although no evidence of a specific need in Keelby has been shown nor has there been any consideration given to providing opportunities in existing designated sites. However, even if evidence of a specific local need was demonstrated and existing sites proved unsuitable, there is no compelling

evidence showing why the proposed office space could not be provided within the developed footprint of Keelby or some other nearby settlement.

12. Therefore the proposed development would not accord with Policies LP2 and LP5 of the Local Plan which seek to direct new employment development towards specifically designated employment sites unless it can be demonstrated that there are no suitable or appropriate sites or buildings within allocated sites or within the built up area of an existing settlement. The scheme would also not accord with Policy LP55 which seeks to ensure that the rural location for any enterprise is justified to maintain or enhance the rural economy.

Character and Appearance

13. Although the site is reasonably close to the commercial unit on the opposite side of the A18 it is clearly more closely associated with the surrounding countryside than the settlement which lies behind the vehicle sales business site. While the holiday lodges would be relatively small they would not be accompanied by any other facilities and the development would appear intrusive and contrived in the context of the wider countryside. The scale and design of the office block would sit uncomfortably in the otherwise undeveloped rural landscape.
14. Therefore the proposed development would not accord with Policies LP2 and LP55 of the Local Plan which seek to limit development in the countryside and ensure that schemes would not conflict with neighbouring uses and would be of a size and scale commensurate with the proposed use and the rural character of the location.

Conclusion

15. For the reasons given above, and taking into account all other material considerations, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

D Guiver

INSPECTOR