



## DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT

### APPEALS LIST - 26TH JUNE 2026

#### APPLICATION NUMBER & SITE ADDRESS

#### APPEAL REFERENCE & STATUS

#### OFFICER & PROCEDURE

DM/0740/24/CEU  167 Hainton Avenue Grimsby North East Lincolnshire DN32 9LF	AP/006/25  INPROG	Bethany Loring  Written Representation
DM/0854/25/CEA  4 Westhill Road Grimsby North East Lincolnshire DN34 4SF	AP/004/26  INPROG	Abigail Hattersley  Written Representation
DM/0721/25/FULA  Woodland View Old Main Road Barnoldby Le Beck North East Lincolnshire DN37 0BE	AP/005/26  INPROG	Mark Danforth  Fast Track
DM/0536/23/FULA  119 Humberston Fitties Humberston North East Lincolnshire DN36 4EZ	AP/006/26  INPROG	Mark Danforth  Written Representation
DM/0919/25/FUL  17 Walker Avenue Grimsby North East Lincolnshire DN33 2LL	AP/007/26  INPROG	Abigail Hattersley  Written Representation

--	--

DM/0749/25/OUT  Land Off Mushroom Lane Brigsley North East Lincolnshire DN37 0BJ	AP/008/26  INPROG	Lauren Birkwood  Written Representation
DM/0806/24/FUL  Land Adjacent To 9 Ashby Close And 19 Glenfield Road Grimsby North East Lincolnshire	AP/009/26  INPROG	Lauren Birkwood  Written Representation
DM/0189/26/TPO  32 Meadowbank Great Coates North East Lincolnshire DN37 9PG	AP/011/26  INPROG	Paul Chaplin  Fast Track
DM/0713/25/FUL  39A And 39B Lord Street Grimsby North East Lincolnshire DN31 2ND	AP/012/26  INPROG	Lauren Birkwood  Written Representation

--	--



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 April 2026

by **J Symmons BSc (Hons) CEng MICE**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 1 June 2026

---

**Appeal Ref: 6003456**

**Grange Farm House, Waltham Road, Barnoldby Le Beck**

**North East Lincolnshire DN37 0AR**

- 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 Carmand Ltd against the decision of North East Lincolnshire Council.
  - The application Ref is DM/1053/24/FUL.
  - The development proposed is change of use of house to staff accommodation and change of use of an existing outbuilding/stable block to supported living accommodation along with some extensions.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Preliminary Matters

2. A revised description of development was agreed between the main parties, and I have adopted this in the header above.
3. In support of the proposal, the appellant submitted Drawing Reference RD:5731-08 titled Site Context Plan which illustrates the relationship of the appeal site to nearby services, facilities, bus stops, and surrounding development, including approved and under construction schemes. The drawing does not alter the proposal. As the Council and interested parties have had the opportunity to comment, I am satisfied that no party would be prejudiced by its submission, and I have taken it into account in my determination.
4. In its appeal statement, the Council refers to the National Statement of Expectations for Supported Housing. However, this document was neither cited at the application stage nor forms part of the reasons for refusal. Its introduction would therefore procedurally be unfair. Accordingly, I have not taken it into account in my assessment.

### Main Issue

5. The main issue in the determination of the appeal is whether the appeal site would be a suitable location for the proposed development, particularly with regard to having suitable and sustainable access to services and facilities.

### Reasons

6. The appeal site comprises an access and parking area alongside a stable block adjacent to Grange Farm House. The surrounding area is predominantly agricultural in character, albeit with some nearby development including Veronica's

- Larder, associated farm buildings and outbuildings and, at a greater distance, limited residential and holiday accommodation.
7. The Council identifies the site as lying outside the defined development boundaries of Waltham and Barnoldby Le Beck, within the open countryside. Although the appellant contends that it forms part of Barnoldby Le Beck, no substantive evidence supports this position. Even taking account of nearby development, no evidence has been provided to show the appeal site lies within a defined development boundary. As such, the appeal site must be assessed as open countryside.
  8. The adjacent house is used for supported living, with residents receiving 24-hour on-site care and supervision. Resident movements off site are detailed as being managed and, where necessary, accompanied by staff.
  9. The proposal seeks to convert and extend the existing stable block to provide six supported living units, with a similar level of 24-hour support to that already provided to existing residents. Staffing would remain unchanged and be based within the existing house. Most proposed residents would not drive, and it is not anticipated that they would have private cars. The aim of the care and support is to encourage residents to conduct their everyday activities on their own.
  10. The Council contends that the proposal would be heavily reliant on staff-facilitated travel by private car to access day-to-day services. While the appellant does not dispute that staff would undertake such journeys, it is argued that the presence of nearby facilities and public transport contributes positively to the overall sustainability of the appeal site.
  11. Policy 5 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2013–2032 (NELLP) defines development boundaries and requires proposals to be assessed against criteria including accessibility, sustainability, and site constraints. It supports development in the countryside where it respects local character and fulfils an appropriate rural function. However, there is limited evidence to demonstrate that the proposal would meet any of the listed functions, and it therefore would conflict with the policy.
  12. Notwithstanding this, the appellant places reliance on Policy 3 of the NELLP, which sets out the settlement hierarchy and identifies the scale and form of development appropriate to each designated settlement. However, as the appeal site has not been shown to fall within a defined settlement boundary, this policy carries limited weight and does not support the proposal.
  13. In terms of accessibility, while Waltham Road provides a route to nearby settlements, the appeal site is not well related to a broad range of day-to-day services and facilities. With the exception of Veronica's Larder, most other services and facilities are some distance away. A public house and church are located approximately 800 metres (m) and 965m from the site (around 11 and 13 minutes' walk respectively), with a wider range of shops, including a pharmacy, situated at distances exceeding 1,400m (around 20 to 25 minutes' walk). From my observations on site, these walks would not offer an especially convenient means of accessing everyday services, particularly on a regular basis.
  14. There are also a number of bus stops within the surrounding area that provide access to Grimsby and Cleethorpes. However, these are located at some distance from the appeal site, being approximately 650m to 1125m away (equating to a walk of around 10 to 15 minutes). Limited information has been provided regarding the

- frequency and reliability of the services, and at the time of my site visit I was unable to verify the service operating from Waltham Road due to roadworks resulting in the suspension of the stops. However, from my observations, the walking distance to the bus stops would not be particularly convenient. While such a walk may be tolerated for occasional longer journeys towards Grimsby and Cleethorpes, I am not persuaded that this would provide a realistic or convenient option for regularly accessing day-to-day services.
15. I note that supported living accommodation operates within the adjoining property. However, there is no substantive evidence that the day-to-day needs of those residents are met through sustainable modes of transport, or to indicate the extent to which they may rely on staff-facilitated car journeys. Nor is any meaningful comparison provided with the likely travel patterns of future occupiers of the appeal proposal. While it is asserted that supported living accommodation reduces reliance on private cars compared with unrestricted housing, this is not adequately explained or evidenced.
  16. Having regard to the distances to services, facilities and public transport, and given that the proposal's residents would not own private vehicles, it would be highly likely that they would be heavily reliant on staff-facilitated car travel to meet their day-to-day needs. Although staffing levels would remain unchanged, the increase in the number of residents would, in all likelihood inevitably result in a significant increase in the number of such journeys.
  17. My concern regarding this reliance on staff-facilitated car travel is acknowledged to a degree by the appellant noting that walking may not represent the primary mode of travel for all residents. Further to this, the mere presence of sustainable transport options is not, in itself, determinative. Rather, the critical consideration is whether such options would be convenient and realistically capable of being relied upon in everyday circumstances. In this regard, the evidence before me does not demonstrate that this would be the case.
  18. A number of planning applications in the surrounding area are cited in support of the appeal. However, limited information has been provided regarding their policy context, whether they are located within the open countryside, and their accessibility to services, facilities and public transport. Moreover, the applications referenced DM/0630/25/FUL, DM/0069/22/FUL, DM/0184/23/FUL, DM/0585/23/FULA and DM/0650/24/FUL relate to single dwellings and extensions, and there is no substantive evidence to demonstrate that these are comparable to the proposal before me. Similarly, insufficient detail has been submitted to show that either the application related to a children's care home, referenced as DM/0362/24/FUL, or the outline scheme for 42 dwellings, referenced as DM/0468/25/OUT, are directly comparable. Indeed, the submitted Site Context Plan indicates that the outline scheme benefits from closer bus stops, services and facilities than the appeal site. This drawing also indicates that other developments identified are generally more closely related to the defined development boundaries of Waltham and Barnoldby Le Beck. In the absence of evidence to the contrary, these sites are, in all likelihood, more consistent with the objectives of Policies 3 and 5 of the NELLP than the appeal site. Accordingly, the examples do not change my view on the sustainability of the appeal site's location or its likely reliance on car-based travel.

19. Consequently, the appeal site has not been shown to be in a suitable location for the proposed development, particularly in regard to having suitable and sustainable access to services and facilities. It would conflict with Policy 5 of the NELLP and Section 9 of the Framework.

### **Other matters**

20. While it may be that previous decisions have not disputed the principle of development on the appeal site, this does not remove the need to assess the proposal against the development plan and the Framework, having regard to the evidence provided.
21. No objections have been raised by technical consultees in respect of drainage, ecology, environmental health or flood risk. However, the absence of harm in these respects does not, in itself, justify the proposal. Rather, it indicates that no technical constraints arise in those areas, and I take this into account in the overall planning balance below.

### **Planning balance**

22. The Council confirms that it cannot demonstrate a five-year supply of deliverable housing sites, identifying a supply of 3.6 years. In these circumstances, paragraph 11(d) of the Framework is engaged. This sets out that, where there are no relevant development plan policies, or the policies which are most important for determining the application are out-of-date, permission should be granted, unless any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this 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.
23. However, in this case Policy 5 of the NELLP is both relevant and the most important policy for determining the proposal. No substantive evidence has been advanced to demonstrate otherwise or show that it should be treated as out of date. The policy remains broadly consistent with the aims of the Framework and continues to attract significant weight. Consequently, the proposal's identified conflict with Policy 5 weighs heavily against it in the overall planning balance.
24. In terms of benefits, the proposal would provide supported living accommodation on previously developed land, adjacent to an established scheme, with shared staffing arrangements resulting in no overall increase in on-site staff. While these factors weigh in favour of the proposal, the scale of provision is modest, and the reuse of previously developed land would make only a limited contribution to the efficient use of land. Accordingly, I attach no more than moderate weight to these benefits.
25. Economic benefits would arise during both the construction and operational phases, including expenditure by future residents. However, there is no substantive evidence to demonstrate the scale or material significance of those benefits. Given the limited size of the development, any economic effects would be correspondingly modest in the wider context. I therefore afford these benefits limited weight.
26. While it is contended that the rural setting would enhance residents' wellbeing, its relative isolation, limited access to services, and likely reliance on staff-facilitated

travel would, in all likelihood, undermine any such benefit. Furthermore, there is no substantive evidence to indicate that a more accessible location could not equally support residents' wellbeing. Consequently, this consideration attracts limited weight.

27. The absence of objection from the Highway Authority in respect of matters such as access, safety and capacity is noted. Nevertheless, for the reasons set out above, the site's limited accessibility and likely high reliance on car-based travel weigh against the overall sustainability of the proposal. In this context, the absence of a technical objection carries only limited weight.
28. Similarly, the Council raises no concerns in respect of character and appearance, scale, layout, parking or flood risk. While I see no reason to disagree, these are matters that would ordinarily be expected of a development of this nature and therefore attract neutral weight in the planning balance.
29. Paragraphs 115 to 117 of the Framework recognise that opportunities to promote sustainable transport will vary depending on the vision for the site, the type of development and its location. However, this does not remove the need to consider securing realistic alternatives to private car use. In this case, there is insufficient evidence to demonstrate that the proposed residents could meet their day-to-day needs without a high degree of reliance on staff-facilitated car journeys. The proposal would therefore conflict with the objectives of these paragraphs and, given its scale, this weighs moderately against it.
30. The evidence presented in support of the need for the development is limited. While the proximity to the existing facility and the use of previously developed land are acknowledged, they do not provide a clear or compelling justification for the scale of development proposed or for its location in a relatively unsustainable area. The submitted material refers only in general terms to alignment with the Council's health and social care objectives and does not robustly demonstrate a requirement for the additional units. Nor has any assessment been provided of alternative, more accessible sites, including those within defined settlement boundaries.
31. Drawing these considerations together, the benefits of the proposal, whether taken individually or cumulatively, attract no more than limited to moderate weight. Set against this, the proposal would conflict with the development plan and would result in a form of development that is not suitably located in sustainability terms, with a high reliance on car-based travel and without a clearly demonstrated need. In this context, and having regard to the policies of the Framework taken as a whole, the adverse impacts of granting permission would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits. Accordingly, the presumption in favour of sustainable development does not indicate that planning permission should be granted, and the proposal would not represent sustainable development.

## **Conclusion**

32. For the reasons given above and after considering the issues raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

*J Symmons*

INSPECTOR