



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 December 2025

by **L Wilson BA (Hons) MA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 5th January 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/U2750/W/25/3374672

Cliffe Country Lodges, Cliffe Common, Selby YO8 6PA

- 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 R Finney against the decision of North Yorkshire Council.
 - The application Ref is ZG2024/1112/FULM.
 - The development proposed was originally described as full planning application for the change of use of land for the siting of 33 holiday lodges and the creation of a pond and associated works for extension of existing holiday park at 'Cliffe Country Lodges'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The address of the appeal site differs slightly on the application form to that used on the appeal form and on the Council's decision notice. I have used the address sited on the appeal form as this is a more precise reflection of the site location.
3. There is a further appeal relating to Cliffe Country Lodges before me¹. As the proposals differ, I have dealt with the appeals separately.

Main Issues

4. The main issues are:
 - Whether the proposal would be suitably located having regard to relevant development plan policies;
 - The effect of the proposed development on the character of the surrounding area;
 - The effect of the proposed development on the living conditions of nearby residents, with particular reference to noise and disturbance; and
 - Whether adequate details relating to the disposal of foul water have been provided.

Reasons

Location

5. The appeal site lies outside the development limits of any settlement and is therefore located within the open countryside. Policy SP2A(c) of the Selby District

¹ APP/U2750/W/25/3375869

Core Strategy (2013) (CS) restricts development in such locations, and limits development to specific development types which would contribute towards and improve the local economy and where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities.

6. Policy SP13 of the CS supports sustainable development in rural areas which brings about sustainable economic growth through local employment opportunities or expansion of businesses and enterprise, including rural tourism. It states that development should be sustainable and be appropriate in scale and type to its location, not harm the character of the area, and seek a good standard of amenity.
7. The development seeks to extend the existing holiday park, rather than create a new standalone tourism facility. Policy RT11 of the Selby District Local Plan (2005) (LP) supports proposals for serviced or non-serviced tourist accommodation outside of defined development limits where they comprise an extension to an existing hotel or other form of accommodation (criterion 1) iii)). The policy also requires consideration of matters such as whether the size and scale of the proposal would be appropriate to the locality.
8. The Council acknowledges that Policy RT11 of the LP is not consistent with paragraph 88 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), which promotes sustainable rural tourism, and therefore this policy carries limited weight. Based on the information presented, the other policies are broadly in line with the Framework.
9. The tourism industry makes an important contribution to the rural economy and chapter 6 of the Framework supports a prosperous rural economy. The proposed development would provide economic benefits, including through construction. Having said that, given the nature of the proposal, the construction period would be relatively short-lived. The appellant indicates that the proposal will improve on-site facilities, though the specifics of these improvements are unclear. In addition, they state that visitors are encouraged to use local facilities, pubs, shops and restaurants nearby; however, there is no certainty that this would occur in practice. I also noted on my site visit that there appeared to be a bar on site which could discourage patron's using local establishments.
10. The appellant further contends that the proposal is likely to increase employment as it is more than likely that local people will be employed for grounds maintenance and day to day management of the site. Nonetheless, vague information has been provided regarding the number of employment opportunities that might arise. Notwithstanding this, given the nature and scale of the extension to the site, it is unlikely that the proposal would generate more than a modest level of additional employment.
11. The appeal site is located outside of Cliffe, which is a secondary village, as identified in the CS. Secondary villages tend to be smaller with more limited services, situated in more remote locations away from principal roads and have poorer levels of public transport.
12. The site is detached from Cliffe and in any event Cliffe has very few services to maintain or enhance and is regarded as an unsustainable settlement. It is unlikely that visitors would walk to Cliffe given the lack of footpaths along much of the route, speed and frequency of vehicles, as well as lack of street lighting. Thus, the

site is remote from services and has poor access to everyday facilities. It is therefore likely that patrons would rely on the use of a private vehicle.

13. There is no substantive evidence before me to demonstrate that the development would specifically contribute towards and improve the local economy or enhance or maintain the vitality of the rural community. Furthermore, taking into account paragraph 89 of the Framework, whilst business needs in rural areas may have to be found adjacent to or beyond existing settlements, the site is not physically well-related to Cliffe.
14. My attention has been drawn to the touring caravan and camping site² opposite Cliffe Country Lodges. The delegated report of that decision highlights that the proposal is an expansion of Cliffe Country Lodges and that the scheme includes converting an existing agricultural building and was amended to just touring caravans. The Council concluded that the development would be in accordance with sustainability planning policies. The reasoning is somewhat limited, so it is unclear how the Council arrived at this conclusion. It is also not evident what evidence was before the Council regarding the proposal supporting the local economy. Nonetheless, given that there are clear differences between the proposals, the planning considerations cannot be directly compared.
15. For these reasons and considering the size and scale of the proposal and the wider site, the proposed development would not be suitably located having regard to relevant development plan policies and would not promote sustainable rural tourism. Consequently, it would conflict with Policies SP2 and SP13 of the CS, and Policy RT11 of the LP.
16. In addition, the proposal would conflict with paragraph 88 of the Framework which supports sustainable rural tourism development.

Character of the surrounding area

17. The site consists of an open field which is adjacent to the existing Cliffe Country Lodges holiday park. Towards the east of the site is a cluster of dwellings and towards the south is Four Acres Holiday Park which is a relatively new touring caravan site. The wider surrounding area is primarily characterised by flat, open fields.
18. The appellant highlights that they intend to maintain the rural character of the site, rich in nature and biodiversity. The proposal includes a small central lake which would add ecological and visual enhancements for the site as a whole. Furthermore, unlike the appeal site, a large amount of the district falls within the Green Belt.
19. The proposed development would erode the openness of the site and would lead to further sprawl northwards from the existing holiday park which would have an urbanising effect. Although the development would be to the rear of the existing holiday park, it would be visible from the surrounding area, including along Moor Lane. The proposed planting would assist in screening and softening the development. However, it would take a number of years to establish. Considering the size of the site, and number of units proposed, the proposal would result in a significant expansion of the holiday park. It would lead to further encroachment

² 2021/0925/FUL

into the countryside and would result in a relatively large site and concentration of visitor accommodation.

20. For these reasons, and considering the scale of the development, as well as the associated internal roads and areas of hardstanding, and cumulative effects of the proposal along with the existing holiday park and caravan site, the development would have a harmful effect on the character of the surrounding area. Consequently, it would conflict with Policies SP13, SP18 and SP19 of the CS and Policies ENV1 and RT11 of the LP. These collectively seek, amongst other things, to ensure the size and scale of tourist accommodation would be appropriate to the locality and not harm the character of the area.
21. In addition, it would conflict with paragraph 88 of the Framework which supports sustainable rural tourism development which respects the character of the countryside.

Living conditions

22. As stated above, towards the east of the site is a cluster of dwellings. The proposed development includes units close to the shared boundaries of these dwellings. The proposal has the potential to cause noise and disturbance through the increased comings and goings of motor vehicles and from occupants of the units.
23. A Noise Impact Assessment (NIA) has been provided. The acoustic environment was deemed to be 'low' to 'moderate' with the noise climate affected by road traffic and tractor engine noise. On my site visit (which was a single snapshot in time), I also noted that there was a level of background noise. As emphasised by the Council's Environmental Health Officer (EHO), the cumulative impacts of car movement, door slamming and patron noise have not been adequately addressed in the NIA, which could reasonably occur concurrently. The EHO highlights that the cumulative impacts of these sources, and increase in Ambient Noise Level, would be nearing a Significant Observed Adverse Effect Level of +5dB.
24. Furthermore, the NIA sets out that the site is only used by those over the age of 55 and amplified music is not permitted on-site. However, there is no mechanism before me to secure occupation by persons of a certain age, or any other clear evidence suggesting that the site would be restricted to over 55's only. From a planning perspective, it would also be difficult to enforce a condition relating to music.
25. Additionally, the appellant has failed to address the EHO's consultation comments regarding clarification on the use of the lodges, noise insulation measures and plans for managing occupancy. The site management plan submitted also relates to a different site, which I recognise is referred to in the NIA, but it is unclear whether the site rules and noise management strategy are currently or proposed to be identical to those set out.
26. For the reasons given above and considering the scale of the proposal, I am not satisfied that conditioning the noise management plan would adequately address this reason for refusal. Consequently, in the absence of sufficient evidence to the contrary, the proposed development would have an unacceptable effect on the living conditions of nearby residents, with particular reference to noise and disturbance. Subsequently, it would conflict with Policies ENV1 and RT11 of the

LP. These collectively seek, amongst other matters, to ensure tourist accommodation does not have a significant adverse effect on the amenity of adjoining occupiers.

Foul water

27. It is indicated on the application form that the method of foul sewage disposal is unknown. The Environment Agency raised objections to the previous application due to the lack of information on foul drainage, and no additional information has been provided to address these concerns.
28. The Ouse and Derwent Internal Drainage Board has assets on the north-western boundary of the site in the form of Cliffe Common Drain. This watercourse is known to be subject to high flows during storm events. In order to protect the embankment of the watercourse from any subsidence/movement and in the event that the watercourse needed widening in the future, they require no buildings, structures, hardstanding, road/parking areas or planting within 9 metres of the watercourse.
29. The appellant sets out that a workable drainage scheme can be achieved, and this could adequately be covered by way of a planning condition. No technical evidence or drainage strategy has been submitted to overcome the concerns raised. For these reasons, and in the absence of sufficient evidence to the contrary, the appellant has failed to provide adequate details relating to the disposal of foul water. Consequently, the proposed development would conflict with Policies SP15 and SP19 of the CS. These collectively seek, amongst other things, to achieve high quality design and promote sustainable development.

Other Matters

30. The appellant states that due to the success of the existing holiday park they wish to expand, and that they have vast experience in the industry. Furthermore, they highlight the benefits of the proposal, including those outlined above and that the site would be further enhanced with landscaping and biodiversity improvements. The benefits of the proposed development, and other matters raised, would not outweigh the harm and conflict I have found above.

Conclusion

31. For the reasons given above, having considered the development plan as a whole, the approach in the Framework, and all other material considerations, the appeal does not succeed.

L Wilson

INSPECTOR