
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 May 2017

by B Bowker Mplan MRTPI

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

Decision date: 2 June 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/D2510/W/17/3167651

The Bungalow, Mumby Road, Hogsthorpe PE24 5PD

- 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 Carole Roby against the decision of East Lindsey District Council.
 - The application Ref N/125/01840/16, dated 6 September 2016, was refused by notice dated 20 December 2016.
 - The development proposed is change of use to store up to twenty caravans over winter.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. I have also dealt with two other appeals¹ on this site. The appeals are the subject of separate decisions.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site comprises a caravan site located to the rear of 'The Bungalow' and a workshop building. The proposed caravan storage area would be set behind the workshop and existing certificated caravan site on an area of hardstanding. The site is surrounded by relatively level open fields which gives the area an open rural character. The A52 crosses the front of the site in a north west to south east direction.
5. During my site visit, I observed the site whilst travelling towards it along the A52 from the west. I saw that vegetation along the western boundary of the site is insubstantial with varying heights, gaps and some plants at the early stage of growth. Consequently, vegetation along the western boundary would not be able to fully screen the combined mass of 20 caravans. Taking into account the larger scale of the proposal and its winter use of the site when leaf cover is low, it would be more visually prominent than the 5 certificated caravans at the site. Unlike the proposed WC/shower unit, visually the stored caravans combined would be large in scale and sited away from The Bungalow and workshop building. Consequently, the proposal would be a prominent and

¹ APP/D2510/W/17/3167606 & 3167619

discordant landscape feature in contrast to the surrounding open rural character.

6. It is put to me that additional landscaping and the use of evergreen species would ensure that the proposal is fully screened. However, it would take some time for a sufficient evergreen landscaping scheme to become established and fully screen the proposal. Consequently, the proposal would be a discordant and prominent feature for an extensive period of time. The use of a sufficiently high enough fence to screen the proposal would also appear discordant and be harmful to the surrounding open rural character. The proposal would be screened by The Bungalow and the workshop from views to the north. However, the proposal would remain prominent, particularly when viewed from vantage points to the west along the A52 and east when leaves fall during the winter months.
7. Therefore the proposal would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the surrounding area. Consequently the proposal would not meet the requirements of East Lindsey Local Plan (LP) saved Policy A5 and paragraphs 17 (bullet point 5), 56-66 and 109 of the Framework which are of most relevance to this matter. Combined, these policies seek to ensure development has a good quality of design that does not detract from the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside.

Other Matters

8. In reaching my decision I have considered paragraph 28 of the Framework which promotes agricultural diversification and supports sustainable rural tourism that benefits businesses in rural areas, communities and visitors. In this light, I have considered benefits associated with the proposal, which include its support to local tourism, an existing business and the security benefit of the appellant residing adjacent to the site.
9. However paragraph 28 of the Framework states that such proposals must occupy appropriate locations and respect the character of the countryside. Based on my reasoning above, the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the surrounding area. Consequently the proposal would not meet the requirements of paragraph 28 of the Framework.
10. Moreover, the environmental harm identified above prevents the proposal from being considered as sustainable development as defined and required at paragraph 7 of the Framework.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above, and having taken all matters raised into account, I conclude the appeal should be dismissed.

B Bowker

INSPECTOR