



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 November 2025

by Mr R Walker BA HONS DIPTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20th November 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/F4410/W/25/3371629

Long Drive Farm, Limestone Hill, Rotherham Road, Tickhill, Doncaster DN11 9PQ

- 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 Mrs Sally Kirk against the decision of City of Doncaster Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/00212/FUL.
 - The development proposed is replace existing caravan with a permanent residence domestic caravan.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are:
 - Whether the proposal is inappropriate development in the Green Belt having regard to the National Planning Policy Framework (Framework) and any relevant development plan policies; and
 - If it is inappropriate development, whether the harm by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations, so as to amount to the very special circumstances necessary to justify the development.

Reasons

Inappropriate development

3. The appeal site comprises of a smallholding in the Green Belt containing, amongst other things, a workshop building, stores, raised beds, a chicken house and a polytunnel. The land to the north of the access track is a grassed area where the caravan to be replaced was sited.
4. Policy 1 of the Doncaster Local Plan (LP), says, amongst other things, that within the Green Belt, national planning policy will be applied including the presumption against inappropriate development except in very special circumstances. In this regard, the Framework stipulates, amongst other things, that development is inappropriate unless it meets one of the exceptions listed in either paragraph 154 or 155 of the Framework.
5. The appellant has not drawn my attention to any of these specific exceptions but suggests that no development would occur. However, a material change of use, is classified as development requiring planning permission. In this regard, as the proposal seeks a material change of use of the land to the siting of a caravan for

permanent residential occupation, the scheme falls to be assessed under paragraph 154 h) of the Framework. This exception refers to, amongst other things, material changes in the use of land provided they preserve its openness and do not conflict with the purposes of including land within it.

6. Openness is an essential characteristic of the Green Belt and has a spatial and visual aspect. Green Belt purposes that appear to be served by the designation of the appeal site within the Green Belt include, amongst others, checking unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas and safeguarding the countryside from encroachment.
7. I accept that a replacement caravan would have similarities in terms of their physical presence in the Green Belt. However, its use for permanent residential occupation would result in a significant intensification of activity, parked cars, and a significant increase in lighting, and domestic accoutrements. The extent of screening from public areas would mean that the visual harm would be toward the lower end of the spectrum but there would still be harm from private views.
8. As such, even if the siting of the static caravan in this location in connection with the existing use of the land is lawful, the intensity of use and the visible manifestations from the change of use as described would, visually, result in a small loss of openness overall and subsequent encroachment into the countryside. Consequently, the purposes of this part of the Green Belt would be undermined, and the appeal proposal would not preserve its openness. The proposal would therefore be at odds with paragraph 154 h) of the Framework. Moreover, it would not accord with any of the other exceptions listed in the Framework.
9. I therefore find that the proposal would comprise inappropriate development in the Green Belt, resulting in a loss of openness and would impact on the purposes of including the land within the Green Belt. As such, it would be contrary to the relevant Green Belt guidance within the Framework and would be at odds with Policy 1 of the LP in this regard.

Other considerations

10. No other harms have been identified by the Council. However, the lack of harm in these respects' weighs neither for nor against the proposal. The appellant has animals and grows plants and vegetables at the site and offers products locally. Biodiversity and ecology enhancements have been undertaken by the appellant, and I have no reason to doubt the appellant's intentions to maintain the land in a positive manner. However, no firm details are before me of a functional requirement to live on site, such as that associated with agricultural workers dwellings, or how these benefits are dependent on the scheme before me. I understand that the proposal would meet the appellant's need for accommodation. However, personal circumstances will seldom outweigh more general planning concerns and the appellant's desire to occupy the site permanently does not, therefore, amount to very special circumstances that weigh in favour of the proposal.

Other Matters

11. Concerns regarding the processing of the application, including matters relating to the site visit, are not matters for my consideration as part of this appeal and I have assessed the proposal on its own merits.

Conclusion

12. The proposed development would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would conflict with Policy 1 of the LP. Even though the extent of harm to the openness of the Green Belt is at the lower end of the spectrum, the Framework indicates that inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and that substantial weight should be given to that harm. Very special circumstances will not exist unless the harm to the Green Belt and any other harm are clearly outweighed by other considerations.
13. Drawing the above together, the other considerations, in this instance, do not clearly outweigh the harm that I have identified. Consequently, the very special circumstances necessary to justify the proposed development do not exist.
14. The proposed development would conflict with the development plan when read as a whole, and there are no material considerations that indicate that the appeal decision should be taken other than in accordance with it.
15. For the reasons given above, and having regard to all matters before me, the appeal is dismissed.

Mr R Walker

INSPECTOR