



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 August 2025

by Gary Deane BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 08 September 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/U2370/W/25/3364788

1-2 The Estuary Riverside Chalets, Wardleys Lane, Hambleton, Lancashire FY6 9DX

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Elaine Shore against the decision of Wyre Borough Council.
 - The application reference is 25/00063/FUL.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a timber clad building to be used for storage of mobility equipment, storage of maintenance equipment, laundry facility, sensory room, office, toilet and WC and plant room. Building to be used in conjunction with the existing holiday business.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the local area.

Reasons

3. The proposal is to erect a detached, timber-clad storage building on grassland next to two detached holiday chalets in the countryside, which is to be recognised for its open rural character and intrinsic beauty. While there is generally a loose and sporadic pattern of existing development within the local area, the context of the site is open and rural. That impression is reinforced by the expansive views from the site across gently undulating rural landscape and the river estuary.
4. To safeguard the countryside, planning policies generally aim to resist development that would adversely affect its open, rural character. Accordingly, development is limited to specific exceptions, which are listed in Policy SP4 of the Wyre Local Plan (2011-2031) (incorporating partial update of 2022) (LP).
5. The first relevant exception is holiday accommodation in line with LP Policy EP9. To comply with this policy, any new building and supporting infrastructure must be necessary and the totality of development should be appropriate in scale and appearance to the local landscape. A second relevant exception is the expansion of business in rural areas in accordance with LP Policy EP8. This policy supports business growth, but any new building must be necessary, and the scale of the activity must not be detrimental to the rural character of the area. None of the other exceptions in LP Policy SP4 would apply in this instance.
6. The new building has been designed to reflect the contemporary style of the existing chalets. Although lower in height than a storage building that was recently

refused planning permission on appeal, it would still introduce a substantial new built form into an open grassed area that currently positively contributes to the spacious feel of the site within the rural landscape. Although the roadside hedge alongside Wardleys Lane would screen the new building to some extent, it would be evident from the open land around the site and in distant views from across the estuary. As the new addition would be far larger than the recently approved storage building at this general location, its visual impact would be much greater.

7. Because of its scale and prominence, I consider that the new building would be a conspicuous and visually intrusive form of development in an area where this should generally be restricted. By palpably extending the built form of the existing holiday chalets, the proposal would unduly erode the sense of openness and materially harm the rural character of the countryside. Its harmful impact could not be satisfactorily mitigated by additional planting, as proposed.
8. The Council is also critical of the building proposed, which it regards to be excessive in scale. On that basis, the use of the new building could go beyond the storage needs of the existing holiday chalets. However, there is no clear evidence in this regard and the use of the building for storage could be covered by condition. On the other hand, given the size of the new building and its position alongside other holiday accommodation, there could be a request to use it for another purpose in the future. The creation of a separate unit of accommodation here would be contrary to relevant planning policies that seek to protect the countryside from new unjustified holiday accommodation. It is not certain that this would come to pass but the possibility adds to the visual objection that I have identified.
9. The new building would primarily store equipment and other items needed to serve the holiday accommodation, which caters mainly for those with specific needs in a location provides a picturesque and calm setting. Having this equipment on hand would enable the appellant and her partner to better serve guests with mobility and other needs that would support the business and enhance its contribution to the local economy. I have no reason to doubt that there is a lack of truly accessible tourist accommodation within the County. Once in place, the proposal would also generate employment and an additional income stream through the provision of an office and sensory room respectively. An accessible toilet would also be provided. I am sympathetic to these intentions and acknowledge the public benefits that would result if the appeal scheme were to come forward. However, these benefits do not outweigh the significant harm that I have identified.
10. The appellant has provided a lengthy inventory of the items that need to be stored in the new building and their individual space requirements. Given the space also required for internal circulation and to service or repair damaged equipment, the appellant regards the existing and approved storage arrangements to be insufficient in meeting the needs of the business. Having carefully considered all the submitted evidence, I am not persuaded that the need to provide additional storage space is so great that it necessarily outweighs the harm to the open, rural character of the area.
11. On the main issue, I conclude that the proposed development would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the local area. Accordingly, it conflicts with LP Policies SP4, EP8, EP9 and CDMP3. Together, these policies aim to ensure that development respects or enhances the character of the area. It is also at odds with the policies of the National Planning Policy Framework, which

state that development should be sympathetic to local character and add to the overall quality of an area.

12. The existing tourist accommodation is multi-award winning, and the submitted design would allow for the future installation of solar panels. I do not underestimate the work involved and demands placed on the appellant and her partner in seeking to understand and meet the diverse and sometimes acute access needs of guests. Interested parties support the proposal and state that the proposal would, amongst other things, increase accessible tourism in the area and enrich the experience of guests. However, these considerations do not outweigh the identified harm.

Conclusion

13. Overall, the development sought conflicts with the development plan, when read as a whole. There are no material considerations, including the policies of the Framework, which indicate that the decision should be taken other than in accordance with the development plan.
14. For the reasons set out above, and having regard to all other matters raised, including the absence of objections from others and the steps taken to encourage biodiversity, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Gary Deane

INSPECTOR