



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 October 2025

by J Hobbs MRTPI MCD BSc (hons)

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19 November 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/D2510/W/25/3371234

Greetham Bottom Poultry Farm, Somersby Road, Ashby Puerorum, Lincolnshire LN9 6QU

- 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 Mr Andrew Bush against the decision of East Lindsey District Council.
 - The application Ref is 02493/25/FUL.
 - The development proposed is demolition of a large poultry shed, and erection of a self build dwelling house in association with existing hotel on site; new dwelling to be built within the footprint of the existing poultry shed.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is whether the appeal site is an acceptable location for residential development, having particular regard to the spatial strategy.

Application for Costs

3. An application for costs has been made by Mr Andrew Bush against East Lindsey District Council. This is the subject of a separate decision.

Reasons

4. Policy SP1 of the East Lindsey Local Plan, Core Strategy, July 2018 (LP) outlines a settlement hierarchy. The appeal site is not within a town or a village. Therefore, it is located within the 'open countryside' for the purposes of the development plan. LP Policy SP8 outlines three circumstances where housing would be supported in the open countryside. It is common ground that the proposal would not conform with exceptions 1 and 3.
5. Exception 2 supports applications for new houses for rural workers. However, it would need to be demonstrated that there is an established existing full-time functional need for a worker that requires a permanent presence on site; the activity should have been established for a minimum period of three years, be profitable for at least one of those years and be currently financially sound; and the housing need cannot be fulfilled by an existing unit on the site or in the surrounding area.
6. The appellant has indicated there would be numerous benefits associated with a worker living at the appeal site, including the improved management of the neighbouring hotel and surrounding land. However, these benefits could also be

provided by someone living nearby. It has not been demonstrated that there is a functional need for a worker that requires a permanent presence at the appeal site. Furthermore, whilst the prior approval for the hotel development may have been implemented, the hotel is not yet operational, and it has not been demonstrated that accommodation for a manager could not be provided as part of that development. Taking the above into account, the appeal proposal would not be in accordance with exception 2 specified within LP Policy SP8.

7. The National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) is a material consideration. Paragraph 88 of the Framework offers support for the proposed development where it indicates that planning decisions should enable the sustainable expansion of all types of business in rural areas.
8. Whilst I note that the appellant never intended to comply with paragraph 84 of the Framework, this indicates that decisions should avoid isolated homes in the countryside, unless one of the stated exceptions applies. The term isolated is not defined within the Framework. However, it is established by caselaw that in this context, the word “isolated” connotes a dwelling that is physically separate or remote from a settlement. Consequently, the proposed dwelling would be an isolated home in the countryside. It would also not comply with any of the exceptions, specified in paragraph 84 of the Framework. Therefore, the proposal would be contrary to the Framework, when read as a whole.
9. The appeal site is not an acceptable location for residential development, having particular regard to the spatial strategy. The proposal would be contrary to LP policies SP1, SP2, SP3 and SP8 where they indicate the locations and types of development that would be acceptable in those locations, amongst other matters.

Other Matters

10. The appeal site is located within Lincolnshire Wolds National Landscape (LWNL). Under Section 85 of the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 I have a statutory duty to further the purposes of conserving and enhancing the natural beauty of LWNL. The proposed dwelling would be well screened within the undulating and wooded landscape which is a defining feature of the area. The proposed dwelling would appear as a cottage within a wooded area which is identified as a key characteristic of the Hainton to Toyton All Saints Wolds Farmland area within the Landscape Character Assessment¹. Consequently, the proposal would conserve the natural beauty of LWNL. The Council does not dispute this.
11. A lack of objections from statutory consultees is a neutral factor and neither weighs in favour nor against the appeal proposal. I also acknowledge the appellant’s comments in relation to the conduct of the Council during the determination of the planning application. However, these are matters between the appellant and the Council and it is not a matter for my consideration on the acceptability of the appeal proposal.

Planning Balance

12. The Council cannot demonstrate a five-year supply of deliverable housing land. As such the construction of a dwelling would provide a needed boost to housing

¹ East Lindsey District, Landscape Character Assessment, July 2009

delivery in the area. The proposed development would not have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area and would conserve the natural beauty of LWNL. Notwithstanding this, the proposed development would not conform with the spatial strategy.

13. As the spatial strategy is not delivering a five-year supply of deliverable housing land, the weight ascribed to the conflict with LP policies SP1, SP2, SP3 and SP8 is reduced. However, these policies are still in general accordance with the Framework as they seek to direct development toward settlements and reduce the need to travel for services and facilities. Therefore, I ascribe significant weight to the conflict with these policies. As such, the proposal would be contrary to the development plan when read as a whole.
14. In accordance with paragraph 11(d) of the Framework, as the Council cannot demonstrate a five year supply of deliverable housing land, the policies which are most important for determining the application are considered out-of-date. In this scenario, the Framework advises that permission should be granted unless the adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the Framework taken as a whole, having particular regard to key policies for directing development to sustainable locations.
15. As above, the proposal would result in an isolated home in the countryside. It would also not conform with one of the identified exceptions where an isolated home in the countryside would be acceptable. Consequently, the proposal would be contrary to a key policy within the Framework. Given this and the distance to the nearest settlement, I ascribe significant weight to this harm.
16. The construction of a dwelling would support the Government's objective of boosting the supply of homes. The Framework identifies the important contribution that small and medium sites can make to meeting the housing requirement of an area. The proposed dwelling would be energy efficient and could include water saving features, high performance insulation, and other measures to reduce waste and energy demand. The dwelling would also be adaptable for all users. Moreover, with the rewilding of land next to the appeal site, the proposal may provide a biodiversity net gain.
17. The proposal would include the removal of a large poultry shed which has a utilitarian appearance. Nonetheless, agricultural development is expected in this area. Accordingly, the existing building is not a negative feature, and its removal alone would not be a benefit. However, the proposal would result in a development that is sympathetic to the local character and would preserve the natural beauty of LWNL.
18. The appellant has indicated that the proposed development would be self-build and has identified that they are on the local self-build register. Whilst I have no reason to doubt this, there is no mechanism before me to secure the proposed development as self-build or custom housebuilding. Therefore, the weight I ascribe this benefit is tempered.
19. Due to the scale of the proposal, I only ascribe moderate weight to the benefits of the proposal. Accordingly, the adverse impacts of granting permission would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the Framework taken as a whole.

Conclusion

20. The proposal conflicts with the development plan, and the material considerations, including the presumption in favour of sustainable development, do not indicate that the appeal should be decided other than in accordance with it. Therefore, the appeal should be dismissed.

J Hobbs

INSPECTOR