
Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 22 April 2026

by **R Satheesan BSc PGCert MSc MSc MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 7th May 2026

Appeals Ref: APP/U2615/C/25/3368669 (Appeal A) & 3368670 (Appeal B)
Land Adjacent to Milbur Mill Road, Burgh Castle, Great Yarmouth, NR31 9QP

- The appeals are made under section 174 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).
 - The appeals are made by Mrs Ami Martine (Appeal A) and Mr Peter Martin (Appeal B) against an enforcement notice issued by Great Yarmouth Borough Council.
 - The notice was issued on 10 June 2025.
 - The breach of planning control as alleged in the notice is: Without planning permission and within the last 10 years, the material change of use of the land from Agricultural Land to a Sui Generis use as a residential caravan site. This unauthorised development of the land constitutes a breach of planning controls for the purposes of the above Act.
 - The requirements of the notice are to:
 - i. Cease the use of the land as a residential caravan site.
 - ii. Remove all caravans from the land.
 - The period for compliance with the requirements is 9 months.
 - The appeal is proceeding on the ground set out in section 174(2)(f) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).
-

Decisions

1. The appeals are dismissed, and the enforcement notice is upheld.

The Appeals on Ground (f)

2. The appeals on this ground is "that the steps required by the notice to be taken, or the activities required by the notice to cease, exceed what is necessary to remedy any breach of planning control which may be constituted by those matters (i.e. the matters alleged in the notice) or, as the case may be, to remedy any injury to amenity which has been caused by any such breach".
3. The Notice requires the use of the land as a residential caravan site to cease and that all caravans are removed from the land which facilitate the unauthorised use. Therefore, the purpose of the notice is to remedy the breach of planning control rather than only remedy any injury to amenity.
4. The appellants state that the two static caravans provide affordable accommodation for people who would otherwise be homeless, including a child. They also state that the limited number of occupiers on the site would have a minimal effect on local services and the road network and therefore questions the Council's decision to take enforcement action.
5. I have great sympathy for the personal circumstances of the occupiers of the caravans. However, since there is no appeal on ground (a), there is no deemed planning application. Therefore, the planning merit arguments raised by the appellants can play no part in my decision. I must take the Notice at face value,

which has been issued to remedy the breach of planning control. That would not be achieved by the steps outlined by the appellants, as it would not remedy the breach of planning control, which is the purpose of the notice and planning permission would still be required.

6. Therefore, the appeals on ground (f) fails.

Conclusions

7. For the reasons given above I consider that the appeals should not succeed. I shall uphold the enforcement notice.

R Satheesan

INSPECTOR