



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 February 2024

by N Kempton BA(Hons) PGDip MA IHBC MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 4 September 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/W/23/3324494

Pilgrim Fathers Caravan Site, Saracens Lane, Scrooby DN10 6AS

- 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 Shane Stephenson against the decision of Bassetlaw District Council.
 - The application Ref is 23/00264/FUL.
 - The development proposed is siting of 5 static caravans for holiday use 12 months of the year with associated infrastructure.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for siting of 5 static caravans for holiday use 12 months of the year with associated infrastructure at Pilgrim Father Caravan Site, Saracens Lane, Scrooby DN10 6AS in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 23/00264/FUL and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Block Plan 2244/BP; Location Plan 2244/LP.
 - 3) The static caravans hereby permitted shall be occupied for holiday purposes only. No person occupying the static caravans hereby permitted shall remain on the site / any one of those caravans for a continuous period of more than three months. Having vacated the site, no person shall return to reside overnight on the site / any of the static pitches until a minimum period of three months has elapsed.
 - 4) A register of occupancy of the static caravans, to include details of motor vehicle registration numbers, the type, number and ownership of all caravans, the names of all occupiers and their arrival and departure dates, shall be kept by the site manager and shall be made available at all reasonable times for inspection by officers of the Local Planning Authority.
 - 5) A maximum of 35 caravans at any one time shall be stationed on the whole of the Pilgrim Fathers Caravan site, as indicated on the submitted site block plan reference number 2244/BP.
 - 6) The design of the static caravans and the materials to be used in the construction of their external surfaces shall be in accordance with that which is detailed in the submitted ABI 2019 Brochure- specifically the Beaumont or the

Willerby Vogue Classique. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Procedural Matter

2. During the course of the appeal, the Council adopted the Bassetlaw Local Plan (2020-2038) (LP). Consequently, the policies cited on the decision notice no longer form any part of the development plan. The appellant has had an opportunity to comment on the following replacement policies, which the Council has identified as being relevant to the appeal:
ST1: Bassetlaw Spatial Strategy (replacing DM1)
ST8: Rural Economic Growth and Economic Growth Outside Employment Areas (replacing DM3)
ST33: Design Quality (replacing DM4).
3. I have had regard to the most up-to-date policies and determined the appeal on this basis.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the safety of those using the highway.

Reasons

5. The appeal site is an established caravan site, which has operated for more than 30 years. The site utilises an existing access onto Saracens Lane, which is an unmade, unadopted access road serving, in addition to the appeal site, domestic dwellings, Mayflower Stables and the Pilgrim Father's public house. The access crosses the pub carpark before egress onto the A638. Beyond the appeal site, Saracen's Lane leads to agricultural land and gallops.
6. The original planning permission, granted in 1990, restricted the site solely for touring caravans. There have been various permissions since then which have allowed an increasing number of static caravans over time, with a corresponding reduction in tourers. The most recent permission, granted in January 2023, resulted in the removal of all touring caravans from the site and allowed a maximum of 30 static caravans for holiday accommodation 12 months of the year.
7. The development that is the subject of this appeal is for the siting of 5 additional static caravans for holiday use for 12 months of the year. This would bring the total number of caravans on the site to 35.
8. The appeal site is located within a settlement. In the immediate vicinity of the access and egress on to the A638 is a pedestrian refuge and a bus stop. These features and the fact that the site is situated within a residential area with the road being flanked by pedestrian footways and streetlights as it passes through the settlement, serves to alert drivers of the potential presence of other highway users. Furthermore, I observed that the A638 is relatively straight at this point, affording good visibility, unimpeded by bends or gradients.
9. The appellant's Transport Note concludes that the development would result in a marginal increase in trips over and above the current situation. Even allowing for any error in evidence used, given the relatively small increase in static caravans proposed, this seems to be a reasonable conclusion. The Transport

Note also concludes that 35 static caravans would result in fewer trips than the 30 touring caravans that were originally permitted. Whether or not this is the case, the caravan park has operated for some time without any apparent highway safety issues. I see no reason why the limited increase in traffic generated by 5 additional caravans would alter that.

10. The Highway Authority has not previously raised concerns regarding the use of the site for 30 static caravans. Based on the evidence before me, and my own site observations, it is reasonable to conclude that any risk to highway safety would not be exacerbated by the small and limited increase of 5 static caravans on the site, utilising the same access.
11. I conclude therefore, that the proposal would not result in an unacceptable impact on highway safety and would be in accordance with policy ST8 of the LP. This supports proposals for the growth of businesses in rural areas provided that several requirements are met, including, amongst other things, that safe access can be achieved by vehicles and that there will be no unacceptable impact on the safe operation of the highway network.
12. The proposal would also be in accordance with part (g) of policy ST33 of the LP, which requires safe, convenient movement for all highway users.
13. Furthermore, the proposal would accord with the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) part 9 paragraph 115 which states that development should only be prevented or refused on highway grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe.
14. Policy ST1 of the LP sets out Bassetlaw's spatial strategy and has no direct relevance to matters of highway safety.

Other Matters

15. The additional static caravans would be sited within the envelope of the existing site and would not be nearer to neighbouring dwellings than the existing caravans on site. In addition, this is an existing use and there would not be a significant increase in vehicle movement or change in how the site operates. As such, it is unlikely there would be any material change to the living conditions of existing residents through such things as noise and disturbance or the consequences of dog walkers using the lane.
16. The existing use on the site is established, with existing pitches well laid out. I observed that there is sufficient space within the site to accommodate the additional caravans as proposed, without squeezing them in. The existing landscaping and established hedgerow boundaries enclosing the site would reduce the visual prominence and appearance of the additional static caravans within the countryside. The limited number of additional statics and the proposed siting of the same, would not significantly change views into the site.
17. Concerns regarding the intensification of this unmade access road and effect on those accessing the gallops are noted. However, based on the evidence before me, the proposed development would not be harmful and would not lead to a demonstrable intensification of use of Saracen's Lane or exacerbate congestion at the junction of Saracen's Lane and the A638, across the pub carpark. The proposed development would not therefore, have a materially adverse effect on the condition of the access road.

18. Representations made relating to the licence for the site and concerns regarding Council Taxes are outside the scope of this appeal. With regards to concerns over the occupancy of the additional static caravans and occupancy records, these matters could be addressed in a related condition- as included in the list of conditions above.

Conditions

19. I have imposed the following conditions: the statutory time condition (1), which is required to ensure compliance with Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990' and a condition listing the approved plans (2), which is necessary to ensure clarity of what has been permitted. Condition (3) restricts occupancy of the static caravans in order to ensure that the approved holiday accommodation is not used for unauthorised permanent residential occupation thereby putting pressure upon local services and to strengthen tourism by ensuring that there is a wide range of properties available to encourage visitors. Condition (4) relates to the operation of the site to ensure the development is in accordance with the approved details and to facilitate monitoring of the site. Condition (5) restricts the number of static caravans on the site, in the interests of highway safety and the character and appearance of the area. Condition (6) relates to the design and appearance of the static caravans hereby approved and is necessary in the interests of the character and appearance of the area.
20. Notwithstanding the Council's comments regarding visibility splays, I have found that the proposed development would not have an unacceptable impact on highway safety and therefore accords with the Framework. As such, I do not consider a condition relating to visibility splays is necessary to make the development acceptable.

Conclusion

21. There would be no conflict with the development plan when read as a whole. There are no other considerations, including the provisions of the Framework, which outweigh this finding. Indeed, the Framework indicates that development proposals that accord with an up-to-date development plan should be approved without delay.
22. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

N Kempton

INSPECTOR