



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: 27th January 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/U2750/W/25/3375869

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 ZG2025/0028/COU.
 - The development proposed is change of use of land for the siting of 3 holiday 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. Cliffe Country Lodges was recently the subject of a further appeal, which I determined¹. While the proposals share some similarities, the developments differ in both location and scale. I have therefore assessed and determined the appeal scheme on its own individual planning merits.

Main Issues

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

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 Core Strategy (2013) (CS) restricts development in such locations, and limits development to specific development types which would contribute towards and

¹ APP/U2750/W/25/3374672

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 would be a minor extension to the existing site, rather than creating 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 development would provide economic benefits, including through construction. Having said that, given the scale and nature of the proposal, the construction period would be short-lived. The appellant states that visitors would be encouraged to use local facilities, pubs, shops and restaurants; 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. Nonetheless, vague information has been provided regarding the number of employment opportunities that might arise. Notwithstanding this, given the nature and scale of the development, it is unlikely that the proposal would generate more than an extremely modest level of additional employment.
11. The appeal site is located outside of Cliffe, which is a secondary village, as identified in the CS. The site is detached from Cliffe, which itself has very limited services and facilities. As such, Cliffe is regarded as an unsustainable settlement, with little capacity for these to be maintained or enhanced. It is unlikely that patrons 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.
12. Having regard to the scale of the development and the evidence submitted, I find no substantive basis to conclude that the proposal would make a notable contribution towards or 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.

13. 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 is for touring caravans (rather than permanent). 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 information 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.
14. The Council set out that the scheme would not improve the local economy as the lodges appear intended for second-home use rather than active tourism. The appellant has not clearly addressed whether the lodges would be for second-home use. In any event, in this case, that would not fundamentally change my findings above.
15. For these reasons and considering the size and scale of the site as well as the scheme, the proposal 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.

Foul water

17. The application form states that the method of foul sewage disposal is “unknown.” Yorkshire Water has objected to the application due to there being insufficient drainage information. The appellant has not provided any additional information to address this objection. They set out that a workable drainage scheme can be achieved in line with the existing foul drainage on the wider site, and that this matter could adequately be addressed by a planning condition.
18. No site-specific foul drainage strategy has been submitted to demonstrate feasibility or compliance with environmental standards. There is a lack of evidence to demonstrate that the existing systems have capacity or that connection is technically achievable. Such information is required to ensure that the development does not pose a risk of pollution or harm to public health.
19. For these reasons, the appellant has failed to provide adequate details relating to the disposal of foul water. Consequently, the 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.

Living conditions

20. The site consists of part of a yard area within Cliffe Country Lodges Holiday Park. New tree and hedge planting is proposed adjacent to these boundaries. The site shares a boundary with Kiln Cottage, and there are further residential dwellings nearby. The development has the potential to cause noise and disturbance through

² 2021/0925/FUL

the increased comings and goings of motor vehicles and from occupants of the units.

21. The appellant refers to the Noise Impact Assessment (NIA) submitted in support of the recently determined appeal mentioned above. However, that NIA relates to a larger extension at Cliffe Country Lodges and different site layout. As the proposed lodges in this case are proposed in a different location, key factors such as their distance to neighbouring properties are not comparable. Thus, the conclusions of the NIA cannot be relied upon in this case, as it does not assess the specific relationship between the proposed lodges and nearby dwellings.
22. Kiln Cottage has a large driveway adjacent to the development site. Its main private amenity space lies further away, and there is a reasonable separation distance between Kiln Cottage's windows and the proposed lodges. The other nearby dwellings are positioned at a greater distance, from the appeal site, than Kiln Cottage. Therefore, their private amenity areas and windows are set further away from the proposed development.
23. The proposal would be adjacent to the existing lodges and would result in a very minor extension to the existing holiday park. Furthermore, the lodges would be located within an existing storage yard. I noted on my site visit (which was a single snapshot in time) that, given the use of the area, there was already a degree of noise and activity being generated in this area, for example through vehicle movement (including utility vehicles) and staff. Furthermore, traffic travelling along particularly Lowmoor Road, which the nearby dwellings are adjacent to, generates a degree of background noise.
24. Given the scale of the development, the current use of the site area, together with the wider use of the site and background noise associated with the surrounding area, the proposal would not result in unacceptable harm to nearby residents. In reaching this view, I have taken into account the separation distances to nearby dwellings and the use of planning conditions, such as those suggested by the Council and relating to a noise management plan. Accordingly, the proposal would not adversely affect living conditions to a degree that would justify withholding planning permission, regardless of whether the lodges would be available for booking or owner-occupied and not available for booking.
25. For these reasons, the development would have an acceptable effect on the living conditions of nearby residents, with particular reference to noise and disturbance. Consequently, in this regard, it would accord with Policies ENV1 and RT11 of the LP. These seek to ensure tourist accommodation does not have a significant adverse effect on the amenity of adjoining occupiers.

Other Matters

26. The appellant highlights that the proposal would make better use of an underused storage yard. They state that due to the success of the existing holiday park they wish to expand, and that they have vast experience in the industry. Furthermore, the appellant highlights 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 development, and other matters raised, would not outweigh the harm and conflict I have found above.

Conclusion

27. I have found that the proposal would not be suitably located having regard to relevant development plan policies and would not promote sustainable rural tourism. Furthermore, the appellant has failed to provide adequate details relating to the disposal of foul water. Although I have found the development acceptable in terms of its effect on the living conditions of nearby residents, that is a neutral consideration in the planning balance. I have taken into account the benefits of the scheme. However, these do not outweigh the harm I have found and the conflict with the development plan.
28. 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