



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 July 2025

by F Harrison BA(Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22 July 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/F4410/W/25/3363235

Parcel of agricultural land (off Great North Road), to the north of Forest View, Great North Road, Bawtry, Doncaster

Grid Reference Easting: 464591, Grid Reference Northing: 395998

- 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 Keith Huddlestone against the decision of City of Doncaster Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/01428/FUL.
 - The development proposed is described as the construction of a site entrance (vehicular and pedestrian) directly off of the A638 the Great North Road onto site, site access to be utilised for agricultural purposes only.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on highway safety, with regard to agricultural vehicles.

Reasons

3. The proposal would provide a new access to a parcel of agricultural land, currently served by an existing access a short distance to the south of the appeal site. The Great North Road in the appeal site locality is generally linear with good visibility in either direction. However, it is a well-used, 60 miles per hour and unlit road. Furthermore, owing to the number of existing accesses, traffic calming measures have been implemented proximate to the appeal site, including pedestrian refuge and painted islands designed to manage traffic flow and enhance safety.
4. The proposal would introduce an additional access in a location that is already sensitive to distraction or confusion where drivers need to take more care. In combination with the speed and volume of vehicles, an additional access on this stretch of the road for agricultural vehicles would unacceptably create conflict between road users. Despite the proposed ghost right turn island, in my view the proposal would undermine the safety of right turning movements into and out of the appeal site to the detriment of highway safety. I note that there is also an objection on this basis from the Council's highways development and control team.
5. The new access is said to be required to facilitate agricultural processes however there is no further information about what this would include or the types of agricultural vehicles that would be using the access. Given the location of the proposed access proximate to the pedestrian refuge island there are uncertainties

whether right turning movements involving agricultural vehicles would be able to safely take place. In coming to this conclusion, I have taken account of the broad spectrum of agricultural vehicles that would reasonably be using the access, which could include large vehicles and the towing of trailers and machinery.

6. Given the linear nature of Great North Road and limited opportunities for turning around, particularly for large vehicles towing trailers or machinery, it would be impractical to prevent vehicles turning right as suggested by the appellant as this would unreasonably restrict the operation of the farming enterprise should trips be required north of the site. This is not therefore a matter that could be overcome by the imposition of a planning condition as it would fail to meet the tests set out in Paragraph 57 of the National Planning Policy Framework.
7. While similar right turning movements from other access points along this stretch of Great North Road currently take place, they do not involve agricultural vehicles, are not proximate to a pedestrian refuge island and in the case of Bawtry Paintball and the animal shelter include signage at the roadside which would alert drivers that there was an access point. The caravan and motorhomes premises to the south of the appeal site could involve vehicles towing caravans and large motorhomes, which if turning right out onto the Great North Road would be close to a pedestrian refuge island. However, this access is visually prominent because of signage and the roadside location of the business, whereas the proposed access would be less obvious, and drivers may not be expecting vehicles to be turning out of the site. The presence of other access points does not therefore lead me away from my above findings.
8. The appellant relies on a transport statement which accompanied a previous application¹. However, even if there was no record of accidents in the locality, this does not mean that the proposed arrangements would be safe. The other scheme was also the subject of an appeal²; however, highway safety issues were not discussed, and the appeal was dismissed for other reasons. Nevertheless, there is no clear evidence to indicate that the previous scheme which was for holiday lodges is directly comparable to this appeal. In any event, I have undertaken my own assessment.
9. Despite the relatively small section of land, I see no clear reason why some form of washing facilities couldn't be accommodated within the red edge plan near to the junction with the highway. This could be secured through the imposition of a planning condition and would ensure there was no detrimental effect to highway safety from debris being brought onto the road.
10. While the appellant indicates that the existing access is not suitable, it is not clear that the farming operations that take place on the parcel of land require a new access. As such there is no clear indication that a new dedicated access would be commensurate with the existing use, as required by Policy 25 of the Doncaster Local Plan 2015-2035 (2021) (DLP). It has also not been shown with any substantive evidence that there has been a particular issue with the current access or that it is inherently unsafe.
11. I did not observe the existing access to be particularly narrow, indeed immediately adjacent to the junction with the highway there is sufficient space such that there is

¹ Ref:21/02792/FULM

² Appeal Ref: APP/F4410/W/23/3320089

an informal access to the parcel of agricultural land, providing direct access and avoiding the need for agricultural vehicles to use the access track that also serves residential development. Even if agricultural vehicles were to use the access track, it has not been clearly articulated why this would be a particular nuisance to residents or farm workers given the short amount of time a vehicle would have to wait for another vehicle to pass.

12. Furthermore, the Council indicate that the permission for two dwellings at the top of the access track³ required a passing place that has not been formalised, which if implemented would avoid the need for a vehicle to reverse the length of the track. As such, there is no detailed explanation as to why the existing arrangements couldn't be safely used, or why it would be unviable to use the existing access if the parcel of agricultural land was sold to a different owner in the future.
13. There is no pedestrian refuge to inhibit manoeuvres for agricultural vehicles turning right out of the existing access. Moreover, I note that the Council's highways development and control team had no concerns regarding the safety of the existing access. Given my findings above therefore, the proposal would not be an improvement on the existing arrangements in highway safety terms.
14. To conclude, the proposal would be harmful to highway safety, with regard to agricultural vehicles, and would be in conflict with DLP Policies 13 and 25. Amongst other things, these policies require development to not result in an unacceptable impact on highway safety and for new non-residential development to be of a size and scale commensurate with an existing use.

Conclusion

15. My above findings bring the proposal into conflict with the development plan, read as a whole. There are no material considerations that indicate a decision should be made other than in accordance with it. Therefore, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

F Harrison

INSPECTOR

³ Ref: 23/02087/FUL