



---

## Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 15 September 2020

**by F Cullen BA(Hons) MSc DipTP MRTPI IHBC**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 7 December 2020**

---

### **Appeal A Ref: APP/E2001/W/20/3254685**

#### **Former Cattle Housing Building at Village Farm, Brind, Howden, East Riding of Yorkshire DN14 7LA**

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant approval required under Schedule 2, Part 3, Class Q of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended).
  - The appeal is made by Mr Joe Atkinson against the decision of East Riding of Yorkshire Council.
  - The application Ref: 19/04220/AGRN0T, dated 11 December 2019, was refused by notice dated 5 February 2020.
  - The development proposed is conversion of agricultural building to a dwelling.
- 

### **Appeal B Ref: APP/E2001/W/20/3254689**

#### **Former Shippon/Milking Parlour at Village Farm, Brind, Howden, East Riding of Yorkshire DN14 7LA**

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant approval required under Schedule 2, Part 3, Class Q of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended).
  - The appeal is made by Mr Joe Atkinson against the decision of East Riding of Yorkshire Council.
  - The application Ref: 19/04221/AGRN0T, dated 11 December 2019, was refused by notice dated 12 February 2020.
  - The development proposed is conversion of agricultural building to a dwelling.
- 

### **Appeal C Ref: APP/E2001/W/20/3254692**

#### **Village Farm, Brind Lane, Brind DN14 7LA**

- 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 Mr Joe Atkinson against the decision of East Riding of Yorkshire Council.
  - The application Ref: 19/04281/PLF, dated 16 December 2019, was refused by notice dated 15 June 2020.
  - The development proposed is change of use of buildings to 3 holiday units and associated works.
- 

## **Decisions**

1. **Appeal A** – the appeal is dismissed.
2. **Appeal B** – the appeal is dismissed.
3. **Appeal C** – the appeal is dismissed.

## Procedural Matters

4. Whilst the appeals set out above relate to different application regimes, different buildings and/or different proposed uses, they all relate to the same site and are within the same ownership of the appellant. Therefore, to avoid duplication, I have dealt with the three appeals in one decision letter.
5. I have used the descriptions of the development proposed as stated in the Council's decision notices and the appellant's planning appeal forms in the banner headings above, as they are more precise.
6. The site address details for Appeal B state the location to be Bring not Brind. I have taken this to be an error and used Brind in the banner heading above.

## Main Issues

7. The main issues of the Appeals are:
  - **Appeal A:** Whether the proposal would constitute permitted development under Schedule 2, Part 3, Class Q of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended) (GPDO), having regard to the requirements of Paragraphs Q.(b) and Q.1.(i) in relation to works reasonably necessary for the building to function as a dwellinghouse.
  - **Appeals A and B:** Whether or not the proposals should be granted prior approval, having regard to the matters set out in Paragraph Q.2.(1) of the GPDO.
  - **Appeal C:** Whether the proposal would constitute an appropriate form of development in the countryside, having regard to relevant local and national policies; and, the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the site and the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside.

## Reasons

### *Appeal site*

8. The appeal site, Village Farm, is a farmstead situated on the north side of Brind Lane within the small hamlet of Brind, which is identified as being located within the countryside. The site falls within Flood Zone 2.
9. The farmstead is composed of a mix of traditional farm buildings and modern steel frame structures. To the south east of the buildings/structures is a farmhouse and to the east and west are existing holiday let properties, which were permitted as part of a farm diversification scheme.
10. The appeal proposals comprise the conversion of a cattle housing building (also referred to as a bull shed) (building A) and a milking parlour (building B) for residential use via the 'Class Q' Prior Approval procedure (Appeals A and B); along with the conversion of a covered foldyard (also referred to as an agricultural store) (building C) and a granary (building D) into three holiday units (Appeal C). Other existing agricultural structures on site are intended to be demolished and removed as part of the proposals.
11. Building A is a large, rectangular, steel portal framed, open fronted structure with a lean-to structure on the south side. It has blockwork walls with

corrugated steel sheeting above to three sides and a timber framed, corrugated steel sheeting roof. The proposal is to convert it into a five-bedroomed dwelling.

12. Building B is a modest, rectangular, single-storey building. It has red brick and blockwork walls and a mono-pitched corrugated fibre cement sheet roof. It is currently attached to building C. The section closest to building C is intended to be removed leaving a completely detached structure. The proposal is to convert it into a two-bedroomed dwelling.
13. Building C is a substantial, rectangular, steel portal framed building, with redbrick and blockwork walls in part and a corrugated steel sheeting roof. It is currently attached to building B and immediately adjacent to building D. The proposal is to convert it into two, semi-detached, six-bedroomed holiday let units.
14. Building D is a small, traditional, two-storey, red brick and tiled roof building with a later blockwork and corrugated steel sheeting lean-to extension at the rear. It sits immediately adjacent to building C. The proposal is to convert it into a two-bedroomed holiday let unit.

### **Appeal A: Permitted development**

#### *Whether permitted development*

15. Appeal A is a resubmission of a previous application which was not granted prior approval in April 2019<sup>1</sup>. The scheme has been amended and a structural appraisal has also been submitted<sup>2</sup>.
16. Class Q of the GPDO concerns a change of use of a building and any land within its curtilage from a use as an agricultural building to a dwellinghouse. Paragraph Q.(b) states that the building operations reasonably necessary to convert the building to a dwellinghouse use would be permitted development, whilst Paragraph Q.1 outlines the circumstances where development would not be permitted by Class Q. It is common ground between the parties that the proposal complies with the requirements of Paragraphs Q.1.(a)-(h) and (j)-(m).
17. However, the parties disagree over whether the proposal complies with Paragraph Q.1.(i). This places restrictions on the building operations which can be undertaken and states that development under Class Q.(b) is not permitted if it would consist of building operations other than: (i) the installation or replacement of — (aa) windows, doors, roofs, or exterior walls, or (bb) water, drainage, electricity, gas or other services, to the extent reasonably necessary for the building to function as a dwellinghouse; and (ii) partial demolition to the extent reasonably necessary to carry out the building operations allowed by paragraph Q.1.(i)(i).
18. The Planning Practice Guidance (the Guidance) provides further clarification in this regard<sup>3</sup>. It states that the right assumes that the agricultural building is capable of functioning as a dwelling. It goes on to confirm that the right permits building operations which are reasonably necessary to convert the

---

<sup>1</sup> Application Ref: 19/00837/AGRNOT.

<sup>2</sup> Origin Structures Ltd. Conversion of Existing Bull Shed. Structural Appraisal. June 2019.

<sup>3</sup> Paragraph: 105 Reference ID: 13-105-20180615 Revision date: 15 06 2018.

building, which may include those which would affect the external appearance of the building and would otherwise require planning permission. It also explains that it is not the intention of the permitted development right to allow rebuilding work which would go beyond what is reasonably necessary for the conversion of the building to residential use. Therefore, it is only where the existing building is already suitable for conversion to residential use that the building would be considered to have the permitted development right.

19. The Guidance also confirms that internal works are generally not development. For the building to function as a dwelling it may be appropriate to undertake internal structural works, including to allow for a floor, the insertion of a mezzanine or upper floors within the overall residential floorspace permitted, or internal walls, which are not prohibited by Class Q.
20. The Council considers that the building operations proposed exceed what are reasonably necessary for the building to function as a dwellinghouse and that they would amount to a fresh built structure not a conversion. The appellant contends that the works would not amount to a 'rebuild' or a 'fresh build' as the main elements of the existing structure are to be retained.
21. The steel frame columns of building A are set into a concrete base foundation and timber trusses span across the main part of the structure with steel sections spanning across the lean-to element. The blockwork wall (approximately 2.3m) frames the lower part of the north and east elevations and the majority of the west elevation. Where the steel columns lie on the wall-line, these have been embedded into the wall. The upper parts of the elevations and the roof are single skin corrugated steel sheeting.
22. The proposal includes the retention of the existing steelwork, external blockwork and timber elements. The roof would be replaced with zinc cladding and the upper elevations would be replaced by new composite corrugated material. New block walls would be installed on new footings internally on the ground floor, with a structural timber frame constructed on these walls to form the upper floor. A new raised concrete floor would be constructed for the ground floor (required to address flood risk issues) and a timber floor at first level, both spanning between the masonry elements. A new glazed wall would be installed into the existing open frontage. This would incorporate a steel frame which would be used to add longitudinal stiffness to this side of the building and give support to the existing trusses.
23. The structural appraisal states that the condition of the steel columns, walls and timber elements are generally good and that the existing steelwork is currently adequate for current loading patterns. However, it highlights that several timber members appear to be over-stressed in extreme loading conditions and includes a caveat that member cross-sections and grades have been estimated. From my observations on site, I have no reason to disagree with this assessment of the existing building.
24. The appraisal goes on to state that it appears that the existing steelwork would be adequate for the intended new use. However, it emphasises that, although the timber members perform well in the new building, several still appear to be over-stressed in extreme loading conditions and includes the same caveat.

25. I acknowledge that a great deal of the works would be internal and therefore, as stated within the Guidance, 'not generally development'. I also accept that Class Q, does potentially allow for substantial works.
26. Nonetheless, it would seem that the capability of the building to function as a dwellinghouse is largely due to the favourable change in the load patterns and the steel being more secured into a more robust structure as a consequence of the internal works combined with the insertion of the glazed steel frame on the south elevation. Furthermore, the inclusion of a caveat, estimations and the requirement for further inspection provides limited certainty that additional works would not be required over and above those proposed.
27. Even if I were to accept that the existing building is already structurally suitable for conversion to residential use, from the evidence before me, it is clear that only its basic skeleton would remain as part of the proposal, namely the foundations, external block work, steel frame and timber elements. All of the other elements of the conversion would be new materials, albeit some to match the existing. This would include the roof, exterior walls and elements of glazing, rooflights, windows and doors. This makes up a substantial surface area of the building's external envelope.
28. Consequently, considering the building as a whole and the collective extensive nature of the proposed building operations, the appeal proposal would be over and above what could be considered to be reasonably necessary for the building to function as a dwellinghouse. The works would go beyond what could be realistically described as a conversion and would amount to a rebuild.
29. In my determination of the appeal I have had regard to the Hibbitt High Court Judgement<sup>4</sup>. This concerns a Class Q proposal and, amongst other things, considers the distinction between works required for the conversion of an existing agricultural structure or building to a dwellinghouse, and works amounting to its rebuilding or, in effect, the creation of a new building.
30. I appreciate that the Hibbitt Judgement predates the most recent advice within the Guidance and note the appellant's comments that it should not be a material consideration regarding this appeal and the conversion of the building at Village Farm. However, it is still relevant in that it concluded that 'the concept of conversion has inherent limits which delineate it from a rebuild' and that 'it is a matter of legitimate planning judgment as to where the line is drawn.'
31. Taking all of the above into account, I conclude that it has not been demonstrated that the proposal would constitute permitted development under Schedule 2, Part 3, Class Q of the GPDO, having regard to the requirements of Paragraphs Q.(b) and Q.1.(i) in relation to works reasonably necessary for the building to function as a dwellinghouse.

#### *Other Matters Appeal A*

32. My attention has been drawn by both parties to several appeal decisions which were allowed and dismissed that are considered to be comparable to the appeal proposal. Of those which were allowed and have been submitted by the

---

<sup>4</sup> Hibbitt and Another v Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government and Rushcliffe Borough Council [2016] EWHC 2853 (Admin).

appellant (Appeals 1-4)<sup>5</sup>, I accept that there appear to be some parallels, particularly in relation to Appeal 3. However, taking into account the limited information provided, it would seem that in those cases the structural integrity of the buildings to allow them to function as dwellinghouses was not questioned by either the Inspectors, the Councils or both, which is not the case here. Moreover, the proposals assessed in Appeals 1, 3 and 4 appear to retain more original fabric of the agricultural building as part of the conversions than the appeal proposal before me.

33. Consequently, I do not consider these cases to be directly comparable to the appeal proposal. In any event, I have determined this appeal on its individual planning merits, on the basis of the submitted information and my observations on site, and with appropriate regard to legislation and Government guidance.
34. I am aware that the proposal received no objections in relation to highway safety, public protection or flood risk. However, this does not alter my conclusion on this main issue.

### **Appeals A and B: Prior Approval**

*Whether or not prior approval should be granted*

35. Schedule 2, Part 3, Paragraph Q.2 of the GPDO sets out that where the development proposed is under Class Q.(a) together with development Class Q.(b), development is permitted subject to an application to the local planning authority for a determination as to whether their prior approval is required in relation to the matters set out in Paragraph Q.2.(1)(a) - (f).
36. In relation to Appeal A and building A, the Council has raised concerns in relation to Paragraph Q.2.(1) (e and f) in that the location or siting of the building would make it otherwise impractical or undesirable for the change of use; and that the design or external appearance of the building would not be acceptable. Nonetheless, given my conclusion that it has not been demonstrated that the proposal would constitute permitted development under Schedule 2, Part 3, Class Q of the GPDO, there is no need for me to determine whether or not the proposal should be granted prior approval, as it would not alter the outcome of Appeal A.
37. With regard to Appeal B and building B, the Council considers that the proposal complies with the requirements of Paragraphs Q.1(a) – (m) and that the proposal would constitute permitted development under Schedule 2, Part 3, Class Q of the GPDO. In addition, in relation to Paragraph Q.2.(1), the Council raises no concerns in relation to transport and highways, noise, flood risk, and design and external appearance (Paragraph Q.2.(1)(a)(b)(d)(f)); and, whilst it has concerns with regard to contamination (Paragraph Q.2.(1)(c)), it considers that this matter can be dealt with by condition. There is nothing before me which would lead me to take a different view.
38. However, the Council contends that the proposal would result in conflict between the residential use of the proposed dwelling and any continued use of the existing agricultural buildings that may remain within the farmstead.

<sup>5</sup> Appeal 1 Ref: APP/D0840/W/16/3143012 Blackberry Farm, Congdon's Shop, Launceston Cornwall;  
Appeal 2 Ref: APP/N2739/W/15/3003584 The Piggeries, Market Weighton Road, Barlby, Selby YO8 5LE;  
Appeal 3 Ref: APP/R0660/X/17/3175487 Grasslands Nursery, Over Peover, Knutsford, WA16 9QY – including As existing building drawing, Photos and Conversion scheme drawing; and Appeal 4 Ref: APP/P3040/W/16/3165076 – Bridge House Farm, Langar, Nottinghamshire – including Conversion scheme drawing.

Consequently, the Council has raised concerns in respect of Paragraph Q.2.(1)(e) in that the location or siting of building B would make it otherwise impractical or undesirable for the building to change from agricultural use to a dwellinghouse.

39. The Guidance confirms that the terms 'impractical' and 'undesirable' are not defined in the regulations, and it is stated that a reasonable ordinary dictionary meaning should be applied in making any judgment, with impractical reflecting that the location and siting would 'not be sensible or realistic' and undesirable reflecting that it would be 'harmful or objectionable' <sup>6</sup>.
40. I have had regard to the simultaneous proposals within the farmstead and the appellant's assertions that the buildings at Village Farm have not been used for agriculture for the past two years, that there is no agricultural activity on the site and that he has no intention of re-establishing an agricultural business at the site. Although there was evidence of previous agricultural activity within the farmstead, none of the buildings/structures were in active agricultural use at the time of my site visit.
41. Nevertheless, even though there appears to be a broader plan for the site and the buildings within it, all of the individual proposals need to obtain the relevant permissions to enable the appellant's scheme to be fully realised. As I have concluded that Appeals A and C should be dismissed, I am of the opinion that it would not be appropriate to allow Appeal B, as it could potentially lead to a situation where a residential use is located within the middle of a farmstead which could re-establish an active agricultural use if desired.
42. The close proximity of building B to building C along with the potential noise, disturbance and odours which would accompany any active agricultural use within the site, would have a harmful effect on the living conditions of any future occupiers of this building if converted. As a result, a residential use within this singular building in this location would not be sensible.
43. Moreover, even if I were minded to allow appeals A and C, there is no formal mechanism or suggested conditions before me which would control the commencement and completion of all of the proposals across the site. This again could lead to a conflict of uses within the farmstead which could be harmful to any occupiers of building B.
44. Accordingly, in relation to Appeal A, given my findings above, I conclude that there is no need for me to determine whether or not the proposal should be granted prior approval, as it would not alter the outcome of Appeal A.
45. In relation to Appeal B, I conclude that the proposal should not be granted prior approval, having regard to Paragraph Q.2.(1)(e) of the GPDO, in that the location or siting of the building would make it otherwise impractical or undesirable for the building to change from agricultural use to a dwellinghouse.

#### *Other Matters Appeals A and B*

46. The appellant has referred to an application at a nearby site, Orchard Farm, Brind Lane<sup>7</sup>, where the Council accepted that the existing buildings on the site

<sup>6</sup> Planning Practice Guidance Paragraph: 109 Reference ID: 13-109-20150305.

<sup>7</sup> Application Ref: DC/16/01213/ARGNOT.

were unused and granted prior approval for the conversion of an agricultural building to a dwelling.

47. From the limited information provided and my observations on site, it seems that the building which was granted prior approval is in fairly close proximity to an adjacent residential farmhouse, with any active and/or potentially conflicting uses located to the south of the farmyard and with, what appeared to be, a separate access. Therefore, the circumstances of this application do not appear to be directly comparable to the appeal proposals and, as such, I can only afford it limited weight in my considerations.
48. I am aware that the Class Q Prior Approval regime was introduced by the Government to make it easier to convert agricultural buildings into dwellings without the need for a full planning application. However, this is subject to certain requirements which I have concluded that the appeal proposals do not meet.
49. I am aware that the proposals received no objections in relation to highway safety, public protection or flood risk. However, these are neutral considerations and do not alter my conclusions on the main issue.

### **Appeal C: Holiday Units**

*Whether an appropriate form of development in the countryside*

50. Policy S4 of the East Riding Local Plan 2012-2029, adopted April 2016 (ERLP) supports sustainable patterns of development which are of an appropriate scale to its location. Part C of the policy supports certain forms of development in the countryside where proposals respect the intrinsic character of their surroundings. This includes the conversion of buildings for economic development, tourism or community uses. Part C goes on to state that conversions for new housing will be supported where the preservation of the building would enhance the immediate setting and where it would re-use a redundant or disused building without significant alteration or significant extension.
51. Policy EC2 of the ERLP supports tourism development including accommodation, particularly those helping to meet existing deficiencies. Part B of the policy confirms that, in the countryside, proposals for tourism development will be supported where their scale and impact is appropriate to the location and either, existing buildings are utilised; they involve caravan sites; are part of a farm diversification scheme reusing existing buildings; they support an existing countryside attraction; or have a functional need to be located in the countryside.
52. I concur with the appellant in that Brind is a small hamlet of dispersed farms, former farmsteads and individual residential properties. It possesses no services and facilities of its own, with the nearest village of Howden located approximately 2.5km away, and has limited access to public transport, with Howden Railway Station located approximately 1.6km away.
53. I recognise that, as stated in Paragraph 84 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), to meet local business and community needs in rural areas development sites may be beyond existing settlements, and in locations that are not well served by public transport. I am also cognisant of the site's moderate proximity to Howden Station and Howden village which are

potentially accessible by cycle or foot along the local roads or the Howden 20 footpath.

54. However, I observed on site that a considerable length of the route along the roads from Howden Station and Howden village to the site has no footpath and is unlit. On this basis, it would be reasonable to conclude that the majority of visitors to the holiday units would be reliant on the use of private cars to access the site as well as to obtain services and facilities in the surrounding area, particularly in the autumn/winter months. I fully acknowledge the very strong eco-credentials of the proposal, but given that the units would accommodate up to an additional 28 people on the site and accompanying vehicles, this would not be sufficient to offset the site's unsustainable location.
55. The submitted evidence confirms that the basic steel frame of building C and the traditional brick structure of building D are structurally sound; that the footprints of the buildings would respectively decrease and stay the same; and that their existing roof heights would be maintained. Nevertheless, it is evident that the proposed extent of rebuild and alteration of the buildings in order to achieve liveable accommodation for the numbers proposed would be significant and, in my judgement, go well beyond what could reasonably be considered to be conversions and permissible under Policy S4.
56. The accommodation would serve larger groups and families, which is asserted by the appellant to be particularly needed in the area. However, no substantive evidence has been provided that it would meet an identified existing deficiency in this respect.
57. Therefore, I conclude that the proposal would not constitute an appropriate form of development in the countryside, having regard to relevant local and national policies. As such, it would not comply with Policies S4 and EC2(B) of the ERLP as referred to above. It would also conflict with Paragraph 83 of the Framework which seeks to encourage sustainable rural tourism and leisure developments that respect the character of the countryside.
58. The Council also cites Paragraph 28 of the Framework in its reason for refusal. However, this relates to the development of non-strategic policies to set out more detailed policies for specific areas, neighbourhoods or types of development. As such, I consider that it is not directly relevant to this main issue.

*Character and appearance of the site and intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside*

59. The appeal site is a moderately sized, compact agricultural farmstead. The majority of the site is screened from view when travelling along Brind Lane by a tall hedge, but it is open to long range views from the adjacent fields to the north. The surrounding landscape is eminently rural, with large expanses of pastoral fields interspersed by field boundaries and modest tree belts. These elements combine to impart a secluded and tranquil character to the site and area.
60. The proposal would provide new uses for buildings C and D that could potentially contribute to the vibrancy of the hamlet and the countryside. However, notwithstanding the progressive eco-credentials of the proposed materials, the extent and form of the proposed alterations would erode the

existing agrarian appearance of buildings C and D and result in them having much more of a stark and rudimentary domestic character. This would be acutely apparent with building D, where the size, scale, design and materials of the new extension would compete with and detract from the granary's modest size, traditional form and muted red brick and clay tile construction. Combined with the changes to the building's existing openings/fenestration, it would adversely diminish the agrarian integrity and merit of the structure.

61. In addition to the above, the presence of up to 28 additional people, associated cars and holiday-let/domestic paraphernalia on a regular rotation of letting, would significantly and detrimentally increase the level of activity to, from and within the site, particularly during the summer months. This cumulative intensification of activity would adversely detract from the positive characteristics of the site and the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside. As such, the scale and impact of the proposal would be inappropriate to its location within such a small and tranquil hamlet.
62. I appreciate that the visibility of buildings C and D within the site in the landscape would be limited. However, their discordant alteration along with the presence of such a significant scale of tourist accommodation within this compact site would be unduly conspicuous when viewed from the wide access on Brind Lane. It would also be readily noticeable from within the site by visitors to the other holiday let accommodation.
63. Accordingly, I conclude that the proposal would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the site and the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside. In these respects, it would conflict with Policies S4(C), EC2(B), ENV1 and ENV2 of the ERLP, in so far as they seek proposals to respect the intrinsic character of their surroundings; be of an appropriate scale and cumulative impact for the location; integrate high quality design; and be sensitively integrated into the existing landscape.
64. It would also not comply with Paragraphs 127 and 170 of the Framework which, together and amongst other things, seek that developments are sympathetic to local character and contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside.

#### *Planning Balance Appeal C*

65. I have found that the proposal would not constitute an appropriate form of development in the countryside, having regard to relevant local and national policies; and that it would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the site and the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside. In these regards, the proposal would conflict with Policies S4, EC2(B), ENV1 and ENV2, of the ERLP. I find these policies to be generally consistent with the relevant aims and requirements of the Framework and I attach substantial weight to the conflict I have found with them.
66. The proposal would deliver economic benefits, albeit temporary, in the construction of the holiday units. Environmental benefits would also accrue from the eco-credentials of the proposal, that would add to the existing offer on the site. The holiday units would also enhance the tourism accommodation provision and offer within the area which would, in turn, encourage the growth of the local visitor economy. This would deliver local economic benefits in the

use of nearby services and facilities by visitors and the potential creation of additional employment opportunities to service the units. These benefits carry moderate weight in favour of the appeal.

67. Drawing the above together, overall and in my judgement, the substantial weight given to the harmful effects of the proposal and the conflict with the relevant policies of the ERLP would significantly outweigh the moderate weight attached to the benefits.

#### *Other Matters Appeal C*

68. I am aware of Wressle Parish Council's support for the proposal. I also note that no objections, subject to conditions, were raised in relation to highway safety, flood risk, public protection, drainage, nature conservation and environmental control. However, these are neutral considerations in the balance and do not alter my conclusions on the main issues.
69. Reference has been made to dialogue regarding the Council's possible acceptance of a new brick building in place of building C. However, this is not before me and it is not determinative in my consideration of this appeal.
70. My attention has been drawn to the presence of a recycling business nearby. The appellant contends that the scale of the appeal proposal is most insignificant in comparison. However, I do not know the details or circumstances of that development and, in any event, it is not comparable to the form of development before me.

#### **Conclusion – all appeals**

71. For the reasons given above, I conclude that **Appeal A**, **Appeal B** and **Appeal C** should be dismissed.

*F Cullen*

INSPECTOR