



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 October 2025

by F P Tinsley MA (Hons) MBA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 5th December 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/E2001/W/25/3370278

Stoneledge Plant & Transport Limited, Victoria Road, BEVERLEY, East Riding of Yorkshire, HU17 8PJ

- 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 Stoneledge Plant & Transport Ltd against the decision of the East Riding of Yorkshire Council.
 - The application reference is Ref: 25/00064/PLF
 - The development proposed is 'Change of Use of a Former Quarry for the Storage of Caravans'
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. I have used the site address and description of development as detailed on the Council's Decision Notice and not that detailed on the planning application form. The revised site address, together with the revised description of development, was agreed in correspondence from the Council to the applicant dated 29 April 2025.
3. The planning application form makes no reference to the application seeking temporary permission for a defined period. However, the Planning Officer's report refers to a two-year duration for the planning permission, and the appellant states at paragraph 2.6 of their Appeal Statement that the permission need only be for a period of two years. I have determined the appeal on the basis that the application seeks permission for the proposal in perpetuity; however, they are content for me to consider granting permission for a duration of two years. This matter is addressed below.
4. At the planning application stage, and in the appellant's appeal statement, it was stated that the proposed development was required by Beverley Leisure Homes to facilitate the storage of completed caravans during a period of market uncertainty, in order to safeguard continued employment at their manufacturing facility in the area. At the final comments stage, the appellant confirmed that the end user would be Coastline Leisure Homes Ltd, who, in correspondence attached to the Final Comments, stated that the site would be used for cleaning and preparing caravans arriving from other parks prior to transportation to their final destinations. I have determined the application on this basis.

Main Issues

5. The main issues arising in the appeal are:
- (i) whether the change of use of land from a former quarry to the storage of caravans would be an appropriate type of development in this location, having regard to the local development strategy for the area and the character and appearance of the area.
 - (ii) Whether the site is suitable for the proposed storage of caravans having regard to access and highway safety.

Reasons

Development Statregy

6. The appeal site is located on a former quarry that has been infilled, situated on the outskirts of Beverley adjacent to a Morrisons supermarket and surrounding retail/commercial development. The site generally slopes from north to south, away from an area of residential development to the north. It lies outside the development limits of Beverley as designated in the East Riding Local Plan Update 2025–2039 (April 2025) (the Local Plan) and is therefore classified as being within 'countryside'.
7. Local Plan Policy EC1 states that employment development in the countryside should be of an appropriate scale for its location, be accessible, and respect the character of the surrounding landscape. In countryside areas, Policy S4 supports the development of employment uses in accordance with Policy EC1.
8. Policy EC1(D) sets out five criteria that proposals must address to be considered appropriate outside development limits in locations such as the appeal site. Three of these criteria are relevant to the proposal before me, as the scheme does not involve the conversion of existing buildings; therefore, the remaining two criteria are not applicable.
9. While the appeal site is adjacent to an existing retail and commercial development, it is not located within or next to an industrial estate or business park and therefore fails to meet this requirement of EC1D(1).
10. I have been provided with a letter from Coastline Leisure Limited indicating that the development would enable their business to expand and allow them to clean and prepare caravans on the site as part of their operations. I am satisfied that they operate within the caravan sector and that the proposal would facilitate the expansion of their business. However, the supporting text to Policy EC1 at paragraph 6.20 is explicit that proposals must demonstrate a functional need to be in the specific location proposed outside of development limits. Substantive evidence as to why the nature of the operations proposed means it must be located on this site has not been provided. Accordingly, the scheme does not comply with Policy EC1D(2) in this regard.
11. Connected to this is the requirement of Policy EC1D(5) that evidence is required demonstrate why the proposal could not be accommodated on an alternative nearby location or on a nearby allocation that satisfies any of the other criteria set out in Policy EC1D. Compelling evidence in this regard is also not provided.

12. It has been put to me that the proposed use is incompatible with sites located within development limits, given the space required and potential access restrictions through settlements. However, this assertion is not substantiated with compelling evidence. The Council has identified two allocations to the south of Grovehill Road within Beverley, BEV-P and BEV-M, allocated for employment development and readily accessible from the strategic highway network, which could offer opportunities for the siting of the proposed development on a temporary basis. Evidence as to why these areas of land could not be used has not been provided by the appellant.
13. There is disagreement between the main parties as to whether the site constitutes previously developed land (PDL). Paragraph 125(c) of the Framework gives substantial weight to the value of using suitable brownfield land within settlements for homes and other identified needs. However, regardless of whether the site is brownfield, it is not located within the development limits of Beverley, and I have not been presented with persuasive evidence to indicate that there is an identified need for the proposal. Therefore it would not be appropriate of the purposes of Policy S4.
14. For the reasons identified above I find that the proposed change of use of land from a former quarry to the storage of caravans would not be an appropriate type of development in this location, having regard to the local development strategy for the area is therefore country to local plan policy EC1 and S4.

Character and appearance

15. While the appeal site is defined as countryside outside development limits, it is located directly adjacent to retail and commercial development at Wingfield Way. Views from distance into the site are limited and largely screened by relatively dense planting along the site boundaries, together with the visual barrier provided by larger commercial buildings, which are the dominant landscape feature in the area. The site is not subject to any formal landscape designation or identified as an Important Landscape Area within the Local Plan.
16. There are views into the site from surrounding residential development to the north and southeast, although these are also somewhat obscured by boundary vegetation. The proposed use would introduce development into an area where there is currently none, reducing the clearly defined boundary of the settlement. However, in the context of the previous use of the site as a quarry and had I been minded to allow the appeal and grant planning permission, I could have restricted the duration of the consent to reduce the potential for long-term landscape impact. Additional conditions could also have been imposed to mitigate harm to visual amenity. Consequently, any harm caused to the character and appearance of the area would have been limited.
17. For these reasons, I find that there would be no harm to the character and appearance of the area as a result of the proposed development. The proposal therefore complies with Local Plan Policies ENV1 and ENV2 in this regard which seek to promote high quality design and development that integrates sensitively into the existing landscape.

Access and Highway safety

18. The appeal site is located in an accessible location, with good access to the local road network, which would facilitate the movement of caravans from the area and beyond.
19. The proposal does not include any changes to access arrangements, nor does it propose additional internal circulation infrastructure beyond the existing concrete access road from the site entrance to the main body of the site. During my visit, the site surface comprised materials such as hardcore, clay, and other varied substances that had been mechanically levelled. No hardstanding was visible other than the access road.
20. I am satisfied that access for HGVs required to transport caravans for storage could be achieved, given that HGVs have previously accessed the site in connection with its former use. I am also satisfied that this matter could have been addressed by means of a planning condition, had I been minded to allow the appeal. However, the transport statement submitted with the application assessed the proposal in the context of the originally intended operator, Beverley Leisure Homes, who planned to use the site solely for caravan storage. Evidence presented at the final comment stage indicated that the intended operator, Coastline Leisure Homes Ltd, would undertake cleaning and other operations on the site. Such activities could involve a different trip profile from that associated with pure storage, which was the basis of the submitted Transport Statement. It is therefore evident that the activity on the site assessed may differ in character from that now intended for the site.
21. The Council raised concerns regarding the suitability of the site, specifically the composition of the surface, to accommodate caravan storage during periods of inclement weather. HGVs and other vehicles towing caravans can get to the site and access into it via the existing concrete road. However, within the site, notwithstanding its previous use, the ability to move caravans and store them is not proven on the existing surfacing material. If caravan cleaning were to take place on the site, this could also result in water discharge, further hindering safe vehicle access and movement on the site. The appellant has not addressed this matter in their submissions.
22. For these reasons, I am not satisfied that the proposed development is suitable for the intended caravan storage, having regard to access and highway safety. It is therefore contrary to the requirements of Local Plan Policies ENV1 and EC4 which seek to maximise accessibility while requiring safe movement for all within the site, including access, egress and minimising highway safety risks.

Other Matters

23. I am satisfied that, subject to appropriate controls secured by planning conditions, the proposed development would not have adversely affect the living conditions of surrounding residential occupiers in terms of noise and disturbance. Given the nature of the development, I am also satisfied that issues relating to flood risk, drainage, and ecology could have been appropriately addressed. Rather than factors supporting the proposal, these are expectations in order for the proposal to be acceptable and as such are neutral factors in my considerations. I acknowledge though that the proposal would contribute to the local economy in a small way.

24. It has been indicated that a temporary permission for a period of two years would be acceptable to the appellant. This would allow time for the market difficulties associated with the caravan sector to dissipate. However, this argument was presented in relation to the previously proposed operator on the site and not Coastline Leisure Homes Ltd, which would undertake cleaning and other operations on the site and the considerations relation to market conditions would appear less relevant. I have not been presented with convincing evidence to lead me to a different conclusion. Nevertheless, as established above, there are reasons why the development is contrary to Local Plan policy. While a temporary permission might mitigate these conflicts in the longer term if the site were returned to its current use at the end of the consent period, it does not sufficiently address them to render the development acceptable.

Conclusion

25. For the reasons set out above, I conclude that the proposal would conflict with the development plan, and there are no material considerations, even if the land were PDL that would outweigh that conflict. Therefore, I determine that the appeal is dismissed.

F P Tinsley

INSPECTOR