
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 September 2016

by Andy Harwood CMS MSc MRTPI

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

Decision date: 12 October 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/Y3940/W/16/3150061

Land adjacent to agricultural building known as: Two Trees, Grittenham, Wiltshire SN15 4JY

- 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 Mrs Pam Ball against the decision of Wiltshire Council.
 - The application Ref 16/02188/FUL, dated 3 March 2016, was refused by notice dated 26 April 2016.
 - The development proposed is to install concrete slab foundation and site a contemporary modest mobile home structure.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The first main issue is whether this is a suitable location for a mobile home, having regard to the proximity of services and the nature of the appellant's use of the site. The second is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

Location

3. The appeal site is a field which includes some existing buildings close to the gated entrance and the nearby road. There is a hard surfaced area close to the entrance. The field has been separated into smaller parcels by various means of enclosure. The proposed location of the mobile home would be within an area to the southern side of the entrance which is enclosed by metal railings. This currently includes a touring caravan, a horse box, a small shed and a table with chairs around it.
 4. The appellant does not dispute that the site is within a rural location. There are some buildings nearby including farm structures and an animal sanctuary. Grittenham contains few facilities and a loose scattering of dwellings. The nearest village is Brinkworth which the appellant states is 1.9 miles away. The site is therefore remote from any day to day facilities and services that would be required by people living there. This is an isolated location. Paragraph 55 of the National Planning Policy Framework (Framework) states that new isolated homes in the countryside should be avoided unless there are special
-

circumstances. There is a similar emphasis within Core Policy 48 and others within of the Wiltshire Core Strategy, adopted January 2015 (CS).

5. There are currently 4 horses stabled on site and the appellant wishes to bring on 2 more that are currently stabled elsewhere. There is no business use at the moment and none is proposed although it is indicated that some domestic fowl may also be brought to the site. The appellant is not a rural worker who needs to live permanently at or near the site as a place of work.
6. The appellant lives remotely from the site and needs to travel there daily at the moment to look after the animals although local people do help and a farmer rolls the field and collects hay. The appellant's vehicle movements to the site for these purposes would be reduced. However living on the remote site would require transportation for main facilities. Although the appellant is currently in good health and not in need of medical services, such matters cannot be guaranteed. It would not be possible to control these or the number and length of shopping trips or visits to social facilities through planning restrictions.
7. The suggestion that the mobile home could be removed when no longer required by the appellant or her daughter would in effect create a personal planning permission. Planning permission normally runs with the land. Planning Practice Guidance makes it clear that it is rarely appropriate to provide otherwise. I am not persuaded that the appellant's occupation of the site would be significantly different from any other person or household. Use of a small home as proposed in the isolated location would be likely to lead to private vehicle use to reach most day to day services even if those vehicles are dial-a-ride services or taxis.
8. The security concerns of the appellant are not unusual where animals are kept within fields in the open countryside. Other measures such as the existing use of CCTV may possibly secure the site. This was also a matter of choice when taking on the site remote from the appellant's existing dwelling.
9. In relation to the first main issue, this is not a suitable location for a mobile home given the remote location away from of services and the nature of the appellant's use of the site does not constitute special circumstances to justify the proposal. This would only be a modest home but it would not comply with CS Core Policies 1, 2, 48 and 60 or the Framework.

Character and appearance

10. The proposal would replace the existing touring caravan and other items that are present on site. There is no suggestion by the appellant that there is any existing lawful residential use of the site. The replacement with a more formalised mobile home on a concrete pad and an ancillary external space around it would suburbanise this part of the rural area. The appellant says that she would not have domestic items outside but it would not be reasonable to prevent the use of washing lines or other outside domestic articles such as garden tables and chairs if a residential use is approved. Although the roadside hedge would provide some screening along one side, the mobile home and land around it would be noticeable from the entrance to the site, from within the field and from those fields adjoining it.
11. This use would not be complimentary to the locality. In relation to the second

main issue, the proposal would have a harmful effect on character and appearance of the area. This would not comply with CS Core Policy 57.

Other Matters

12. The proposal would allow the appellant to move from her existing house. This would free up that home for another household but would only be a very modest benefit of this proposal. This would not outweigh the harm I have identified in relation to the main issues.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above and having considered all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Andy Harwood

INSPECTOR