



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 August 2023

by H Senior BA (Hons) MCD MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20 October 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/N2345/W/23/3319165

The Brambles, Land adj to Thornfield, Darkinson Lane, Preston PR4 0RH

- 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 Gerald Carberry against the decision of Preston City Council.
 - The application Ref 06/2022/1082, dated 14 September 2022, was refused by notice dated 18 October 2022.
 - The development proposed is temporary siting of residential caravan.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. I have removed “retrospective” from the banner heading above as it is not a description of development. On my visit I saw that the caravan was in-situ and have dealt with the appeal on this basis.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is whether the site lies in a suitable location for development, having particular regard to the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site lies within open fields and is accessed from Darkinson Lane. To the rear of the site the vegetation and trees screen the adjacent property. I understand that the temporary caravan is required whilst the occupiers acquire alternative accommodation.
5. Policy 1 of the Central Lancashire Core Strategy, July 2012 (Core Strategy) sets out the Council’s spatial development strategy. It seeks to focus development in accordance with the hierarchy of settlements. Sites within Open Countryside are at the bottom of the hierarchy where development should be small scale and limited to appropriate infilling and to meet local need. Policy EN1 of the Preston Local Plan 2012-2026, July 2015 (Local Plan) sets out exceptions for new housing in the open countryside, including that needed for agriculture and rural workers dwellings in conformity with Policy HS5.
6. The site lies within the countryside, and is characterised by open land, largely free from development except for sporadic dwellings and farm buildings. Darkinson Lane is narrow and unlit country lanes reflecting the rural context of the area. Whilst there are some storage buildings in the vicinity of the proposal, it is not within a cluster of buildings so cannot be considered to be

infilling. It is therefore in an isolated location and encroaches into the countryside at odds with its open character.

7. For the above reasons I conclude that the temporary siting of the residential caravan does not lie in a suitable location for development. It conflicts with Policies 1 and 17 of the Core Strategy and Policies EN1 and EN9 of the Local Plan which, together amongst other matters, seek to ensure that development protects the open countryside from unacceptable development which would harm its open and rural character and takes account of the character and appearance of the local area. It would also conflict with the guidance in the Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document 2012 and National Planning Policy Framework.

Other Matter

8. I acknowledge the assertion that it is necessary for the appellant to be close to the land in their ownership for animal welfare, maintenance of fields and machinery, fire prevention and secure record keeping. However, no substantive evidence has been provided of these issues, and there is no compelling case as required by Policy HS5 of the Local Plan, particularly in relation to sections b and d. I also note that the appellants did not apply for a rural worker dwelling in the Countryside under this exception to Policy EN1 of the Local Plan.

Conclusion

9. The proposed development conflicts with the development plan as a whole and there are no other considerations, that outweigh this conflict. I therefore conclude that the appeal is dismissed.

H Senior

INSPECTOR