



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 December 2025

by Ryan Cowley MPlan (Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 30 January 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/D2510/W/25/3373750

Woody's Top, Ruckland Lane, Ruckland, Louth, Lincolnshire LN11 8RQ

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission under section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) for the development of land without complying with conditions subject to which a previous planning permission was granted.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Tim Lamyman, on behalf of Lamyman Worlaby Farms, against the decision of East Lindsey District Council.
 - The application Ref is 00387/25/RVC.
 - The application sought planning permission for change of use, conversion of, extension and alterations to former youth hostel to provide a holiday let and upgrade existing vehicular access which is an amendment to that previously approved application reference no. N/111/01387/17 without complying with a condition attached to planning permission Ref N/111/02038/17, dated 21/12/2017.
 - The condition in dispute is No 7 which states that: The accommodation hereby permitted shall be occupied for holiday purposes only and shall not be occupied as a person's sole or main place of residence. The owners/operators of the site shall maintain an up-to-date register of the names of all owners/occupiers of accommodation on the site, and of their main home addresses, and shall make this information available to the Local Planning Authority upon request.
 - The reason given for the condition is: To ensure that the development is restricted to holiday use only and that the accommodation is not used for residential purposes. Residential use would be contrary to the provisions of paragraph 55 of the National Planning Policy Framework. This condition is also imposed having regard to Policy T16 of the East Lindsey Local Plan Alteration 1999.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Applications for costs

2. An application for costs was made by Mr Tim Lamyman, on behalf of Lamyman Worlaby Farms, against East Lindsey District Council. This is the subject of a separate Decision.

Background, Preliminary Matters and Main Issue

3. The appellant provided profit and loss information as part of their appeal submission. While this was not before the Council as part of its assessment, all parties have had an opportunity to comment on this through the appeal process and so the Council would not be prejudiced by my consideration of it. I have thus had regard to this evidence in the appeal.
4. The Council granted planning permission for the change of use, conversion of, extension and alterations to a former youth hostel to provide a holiday let and upgrade existing vehicular access at the appeal site in December 2017¹. This

¹ Council Ref Ref N/111/02038/17

permission was subject to a condition (No 7) restricting the occupation of the accommodation to holiday purposes only, with no occupation as a sole or main place of residence permitted.

5. The appellant contends that the use of the appeal building as a holiday let is no longer financially viable and thus condition No 7 should be removed to allow occupation of the building as a permanent residence. The Council maintains that use of the building as a permanent residential dwelling would see future occupants being unduly reliant on the use of the private motor vehicle to access essential services and facilities due to its location.
6. The main issue is therefore whether condition No 7 is necessary and reasonable with regard to the Council's spatial strategy and the appeal site's access to essential services and facilities.

Reasons

7. The appeal scheme relates to an existing single storey building, in use as holiday accommodation, with direct access onto Ruckland Lane. The site is not within any of the towns or villages listed in Strategic Policy SP1 of the East Lindsey Local Plan Core Strategy Adopted July 2018 (the Core Strategy) and so is located in the open countryside for the purposes of the Core Strategy.
8. The Core Strategy seeks to restrain housing growth relative to the infrastructure and size of towns and larger villages. In addition to the settlement pattern, other factors including access to employment, schools, shops and health facilities affect decisions. Strategic Policy 22 supports development in or adjoining towns, large and medium villages where it is accessible to facilities.
9. The appeal site is surrounded by agricultural fields in all directions, with the nearest neighbouring properties some distance downhill from the site to the south, where there is a farm and a church. There are otherwise no services or amenities within a reasonable walking distance of the site. It is almost 4km to the closest large village at Tetford, which has a range of facilities including a doctor's surgery, primary school, public house, village hall and church. While it may be possible to cycle to Tetford, there is no designated cycle route, and the road is relatively narrow and winding in places. It is also unlit which, combined with its topography, is unlikely to encourage cycling, particularly during darkness or inclement weather.
10. I saw that there is a bus stop immediately alongside the entrance to the appeal site, and it is just a 6-minute bus journey into Tetford, or 17 minutes to the larger settlement of Louth. Nevertheless, the evidence indicates that the bus service provided is very limited, stopping only 3 times on a weekday, and only twice on a Saturday, with no services on a Sunday. Moreover, there are no bus services to or from the appeal site before 9am or after 3pm on any day.
11. I recognise that opportunities to maximise sustainable transport solutions will vary between urban and rural areas. Nevertheless, given the infrequency of the bus service and lack of appropriate walking or cycling routes, the sustainable transport options available to future occupiers would be particularly limited in this case. There would thus be an overreliance on the private car for almost all trips.
12. Paragraph 84 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) supports the re-use of redundant or disused buildings in the countryside that

enhance the immediate setting. However, the building is not currently redundant or disused. Even if it were, there is no compelling evidence to demonstrate that its re-use as a permanent dwelling would enhance the immediate setting.

13. While I recognise that guests to the property are already heavily reliant on the private car for transport, the needs and travel patterns of individuals on holiday are materially different to those of permanent residents. The former being likely to primarily seek good access to local tourism attractions and hospitality, and the latter requiring greater access to a wider range of services and amenities including, for example, health services or community facilities, as well as employment or education opportunities.
14. Condition No 7 is therefore necessary and reasonable with regard to the Council's spatial strategy and the appeal site's access to essential services and facilities. The proposal would thus conflict with Policies SP1, SP2 and SP22 of the Core Strategy. These policies, among other provisions, seek to guide the distribution, scale and nature of future development, secure development that improves the economic, social and environmental conditions in the area, support accessibility and reduce isolation in the District.

Other Matters

15. Paragraph 11(d) of the Framework indicates that the presumption in favour of sustainable development is engaged where the policies which are most important for determining the application are deemed out-of-date. This includes, for proposals involving the provision of housing, situations where the local planning authority cannot demonstrate a five-year supply of deliverable housing sites.
16. In such cases, paragraph 11(d) states that permission should be granted unless any 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, making effective use of land, securing well-designed places and providing affordable homes, individually or in combination.
17. The Framework seeks to significantly boost the supply of housing. The appellant indicates that the area has a housing land supply of less than 3 years and this has not been disputed by the Council. This represents a significant undersupply, and the prompt delivery of new housing must thus be afforded considerable weight.
18. The proposal would reuse an existing building and so its visual impact would be minimal, and there would be no construction related impacts. Permanent residents may contribute to the local economy and community, albeit the limited accessibility of local villages from the site would somewhat curtail this. Moreover, it is not clear from the evidence that such benefits would outweigh harm to the local economy through the loss of visitor accommodation and associated local spending. Overall, the social, environmental and economic benefits of the proposal would be relatively modest given its small scale and context.
19. On the other hand, the Framework seeks to ensure housing in rural areas is located to enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities. It promotes sustainable transport and the active management of growth. It also seeks to ensure development gives priority to pedestrian and cycle movements and access

to public transport, and can help to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, including through its location.

20. The strategic policies of the development plan set out above remain broadly consistent with the Framework in this regard. I thus apportion significant weight to the harm and development plan conflict arising from the inappropriateness of the location for a dwelling. The identified harm would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits of the proposal when assessed against the policies in the Framework taken as a whole. Accordingly, the proposal does not benefit from the presumption in favour of sustainable development.
21. The site opened to guests in August 2018. The holiday accommodation has been advertised online and in magazines, which the appellant advises has been costly and unsuccessful. However, the only mechanisms for booking a stay have been via a single online travel agency or directly via the owner.
22. Evidence of occupancy rates has been provided showing a steady decline in guests from 2022 to 2024. The profit and loss accounts show a corresponding decrease in income over these 3 years, which has not covered expenditure when accounting for loan repayments. However, no information concerning the popularity or profitability of the site prior to 2022 has been provided. It is also not clear whether different pricing or advertisement strategies have been explored, or whether there is any scope to rationalise expenditure.
23. The appellant began marketing the site for sale in August 2025, with no market interest in it as a going concern at the time of the appeal. While a sales brochure has been submitted, full details of the marketing campaign are not before me. Given the limitations of the evidence set out above and the short length of time that the property has been on the market, it has not been clearly demonstrated that the site is commercially unviable as holiday accommodation.
24. My attention has been drawn to numerous other application and appeal decisions which the parties consider relevant to the appeal. Based on the details provided, the planning applications in Great Carlton², Haltham³ and Thornton⁴ related to development that was not isolated. The Thornton case also consisted of a reduction in the number of units. The Great Carlton case and the cases in Ranby⁵ and Market Rasen⁶ secured the ongoing maintenance of a non-designated heritage asset, with the latter having been on the market for over a year.
25. The appeal decisions in Bratoft⁷ and Friskney⁸ concerned development that was not isolated, and which benefitted from footpath and cycle access to a nearby settlement. The case in Craven⁹ related to a site also not physically isolated, and which had been in use as a holiday let since 1993. Moreover, it was also in a different local planning authority area and so was considered in a different local planning policy context, as were the other appeal decisions that have been referred to in West Berkshire, Suffolk and Devon. None of these cases are directly

² Council Ref N/063/00931/21

³ Council Ref S/074/00885/21

⁴ Council Ref S/141/00786/20

⁵ Council Ref N/139/02381/20

⁶ Council Ref N/157/01694/20

⁷ Appeal Ref APP/D2510/W/25/3362639

⁸ Appeal Ref APP/D2510/W/20/3245593

⁹ Appeal Ref APP/C2708/W/23/3324369

comparable to the appeal scheme before me and they do not lead me to a different conclusion on the main issue.

26. The site lies within the designated Lincolnshire Wolds National Landscape (NL). Paragraph 189 of the Framework places great weight on the conservation and enhancement of landscape and scenic beauty in NL and I have a statutory duty to seek to further the purposes of conserving and enhancing their natural beauty. The Lincolnshire Wolds NL is designated for its distinctive and high-quality landscapes, which are particularly sensitive to change. The removal of condition No. 7 would have minimal visual impact and would ensure the site is maintained. It would thus conserve the natural beauty of the NL. Equally however, there is no compelling reason to suspect the site would fall into disrepair and cause harm to the character and appearance of the area or the NL in the event the appeal is dismissed.
27. The Planning Practice Guidance and the Framework encourage the Council to take a positive approach and work proactively with applicants. While the appellant's frustrations with the level of engagement offered by the Council are noted, this cannot lead me to a different conclusion on the main issue.
28. While objections were not received from statutory consultees, this does not in itself demonstrate that the proposal is acceptable with regard to the main issue.

Conclusion

29. The removal of condition No. 7 would conflict with the development plan, taken as a whole. There are no material considerations that indicate the appeal should be determined other than in accordance with the development plan. Consequently, I conclude that the appeal is dismissed.

Ryan Cowley

INSPECTOR