



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 September 2024 by Darren Ellis MPlan MRTPI

Decision by Mr R Walker BA HONS DIPTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 5 November 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/D2510/W/24/3337066

The Croft, Back Lane, Stickford, Lincolnshire PE22 8EW

- 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 Andrew Atkinson against the decision of East Lindsey District Council.
 - The application Ref is S/168/01254/23.
 - The development proposed is to site 2 caravans for holiday lets + install septic tanks for caravans.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is whether the site is a suitable location for the siting of caravans for holiday lets, having regard to access to services and facilities.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. Section 3 of Policy SP15 of the East Lindsey Local Plan Core Strategy (2018) (CS) states that new caravan development will be supported where, amongst other things, sites are in close proximity to a town, large or medium village. The appeal site is a short distance from the built-up area of Stickford, which is designated in CS Policy SP1 as a small village. East Kirkby and Stickney are the nearest medium villages, both are approximately 2 miles away from the site. Policy SP15 does not define 'close proximity'.
 5. Stickford has very limited services and visitors using the caravans would therefore be more reliant on East Kirkby and Stickney for shops and other services. Whilst they are not within a convenient walking distance, East Kirkby and Stickney are within cycling distance and there is a bus stop in Stickford. However, from the evidence before me, the bus service does not go to East Kirkby and, furthermore, is limited in its frequency during the day on weekdays, very limited on Saturdays, and with no service in the evenings or on a Sunday.
-

6. The bus stop in Stickford is within walking distance of the appeal site. However, the public footpath next to the site goes through a field which, during the time of my site visit, was used for the grazing of sheep and could be muddy and not particularly suitable for walking on when it is wet. An alternative route would be to walk along Back Lane which is unlit, wide enough for one car and has no pavement, and a significant part of the road has a 60mph speed limit. Altogether this would make Back Lane unattractive as a walking or cycling route when it is dark.
7. It is therefore likely that users of the caravans would use cars to travel between the site, East Kirkby and Stickney. I recognise that the location of the appeal site would allow for occupiers to experience the quiet enjoyment of the countryside and I note that Policy SP15 does not discourage the use of cars. However, given the distances between the appeal site, East Kirkby and Stickney together with the considerable transport limitations, I am not persuaded that the appeal site is within a close proximity to a medium village. As such, the site would not be suitable for the siting of caravans for holiday lets with particular reference to access to services and facilities. Therefore, the proposal would be contrary to CS Policy SP15.

Other Matters

8. The proposal would provide economic benefits through increased opportunities for tourism, and from the construction and upkeep of the site. However, it has not been stated whether the caravans would be available for visitors all-year round or just for certain months of the year. In any case, the economic benefits would be limited by the small scale of the development and therefore would not be sufficient to outweigh the policy conflict above. The absence of harm in relation to other matters including the character and appearance of the surrounding area and highway safety are neutral matters.

Conclusion

9. There are no material considerations, including the approach of the National Planning Policy Framework (2023), which indicate that a decision should be made other than in accordance with the development plan. I therefore recommend the appeal be dismissed.

Darren Ellis

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

10. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's recommendation and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

Mr R Walker

INSPECTOR