



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 November 2020

by Bhupinder Thandi BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10 December 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/H1840/W/20/3257352

Boston View Farm, Boston Lane, Charlton WR11 2RD

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a failure to give notice within the prescribed period of a decision on an application for planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Smith against Wychavon District Council.
 - The application Ref 20/01013/CU, is dated 27 May 2020.
 - The development proposed is siting of ten holiday lodges and associated operational development.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed and planning permission is refused.

Main Issues

2. Mindful of the Council's putative reasons for refusal the main issues are:
 - Whether the proposed development would be in a suitable location for tourist accommodation having regard to the proximity of services and facilities; and
 - The effect of the proposed development upon the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

Location of tourist accommodation

3. The site is located within open countryside. The nearest accessible settlement containing services and facilities is Hampton located approximately 0.7 miles from the site. There is a bus stop located on Pershore Road with services into Hampton and Evesham. Walking to Pershore Road involves walking along a country lane for a short distance with no footpath or lighting making accessing the bus stop undesirable and impractical. Whilst there is a footpath on Pershore Road leading to these settlements visitors are unlikely to use this route due to it being narrow and largely unlit.
4. I acknowledge that these settlements are a short distance from the site. However, given the frequency of the bus service and the constraints in accessing these services and facilities by foot and by bicycle it is likely that occupants would be heavily reliant on private car to travel to the site, services

and facilities and visitor attractions in the area during their stay. Consequently, the accessibility to services and facilities and visitor attractions would be poor.

5. As such, I conclude that the proposed development would not be located within a suitable location for new tourist accommodation contrary to Policy SWDP4 of the South Worcestershire Development Plan (2016) which, amongst other things, requires proposals to offer genuinely sustainable travel choices.

Character and appearance

6. The appeal site comprises a largely undeveloped and overgrown field with miscellaneous items including caravans and recreational vehicles scattered around the site. It neighbours a field to one side and a dwelling and caravan on the other. The wider area is characterised by sporadic ribbon development of detached dwellings in large plots that gives the area a spacious rural character. Whilst the site is enclosed by landscaping its largely undeveloped nature contributes to the surrounding rural landscape.
7. Notwithstanding the timber construction and recessive colour proposed, the lodges arranged in a rigid linear manner and extending at depth for almost the entire length of the site combined with the access road would have an overly urbanising effect. This would result in an incongruous feature in an otherwise undeveloped area of the countryside.
8. Whilst landscaping would largely screen views of the proposal, there is no substantive evidence to indicate they would remain for the lifetime of the development such that they would continue to screen it. A condition requiring retention of the trees to screen the site would be difficult to enforce. Whilst a condition relating to landscaping could be imposed, there is no evidence regarding landscaping before me, thus there is no certainty that it would mitigate the harm identified.
9. As such, the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the area contrary to SWDP Policy 36 which, amongst other things, requires proposals for static caravans to be well related to its setting in terms of design, form and scale and to have regard to landscape.

Other Matters

10. I acknowledge that there is a low risk of flooding, that the highways authority and local authority drainage engineers raised no objection to the proposed development and that there would be some economic benefit. However, these factors individually or cumulatively do not outweigh the harm that I have identified in relation to the main issues.
11. The appellant has made reference to a nearby caravan park. However, I have not been made aware of the circumstances behind its development. In any event every appeal must be considered on its own merits. The presence of another caravan park in the area does not justify the harm that I have identified.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons set out above the appeal does not succeed.

B Thandi

INSPECTOR