



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 2 September 2021

by Chris Baxter BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23 September 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/E2001/D/21/3274878

Towthorpe Barns, Well Head Barn, Towthorpe Road, Towthorpe YO25 3HD

- 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 John Medley against the decision of East Riding of Yorkshire Council.
 - The application Ref 21/00432/PLF, dated 4 February 2021, was refused by notice dated 30 April 2021.
 - The development proposed is described as "single storey extension to provide additional living accommodation".
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the surrounding area and whether there is a need for the proposal.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The area surrounding the appeal site is characterised primarily of converted barns in residential use with agricultural fields located beyond. The appeal property, being a converted barn completed in 2009, has a linear form with simple roof style that matches the attached residential property. It is this uncomplicated roof form which contributes to the character of the surrounding area.
4. The proposed extension would be suburban in style with a dual pitched roof that would conflict with the linear roof form of the existing property. The proposal would be mostly screened from wider views however, it would still be a prominent structure that would be visible from close proximity including views from neighbouring properties.
5. The proposed roof form of the extension would not be in keeping with the existing barn conversion and would be an incongruous feature that detracts from the character and appearance of the surrounding area.
6. The appellant has indicated that the proposal would be constructed from second hand bricks with neighbouring occupiers being in support of the scheme. These matters would not outweigh the harm I have identified above.
7. I have had regard to the appellants statement of case, including a picture of a barn conversion in the area which has an extension. Insufficient information

has been provided on this scheme and I cannot be sure that it represents a direct parallel with the appeal proposal, particularly with regards to location and effects on surrounding area. In any case, I have determined this appeal on its own merits.

8. My attention has been drawn to other barn conversions in the immediate locality that have extensive modifications. I witnessed some of these buildings during my site visit however I did not view any alterations that were similar in style and design to the proposed extension.
9. Accordingly, the proposal would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the surrounding area. The proposal would be contrary to Policies ENV1 and part C of S4 of the East Riding Local Plan 2016 (ERLP) which seeks development to respect the diverse character and appearance of the area.

Need

10. The Council state that there is no justification for why the proposed extension is necessary. The appellant has indicated that due to the size of the property and number of bedrooms, the property is lacking an area for dining.
11. Policy S4 of the ERLP states that conversions for new housing will be supported where it would re-use a redundant or disused building without significant alteration or significant extension. The appeal property is not redundant or disused. The Council considers though that given this property was previously converted then this policy applies in this instance and subsequently the proposal does not represent a sustainable form of development. There is no requirement in Policy S4 for the need of the proposal to be justified.
12. The Council accepts that the proposal is subservient to the main house. Due to the proposals scale, I am satisfied that the proposal would not be a significant alteration or extension. The proposal would therefore not be contrary to part C1ii of Policy S4 of the ERLP.

Other Matters

13. I note that surrounding neighbouring occupiers are in full support of the proposed development, this matter does not alter my findings on the main issues.

Conclusion

14. Whilst I have found that the proposal accords with part C1ii of Policy S4 of the ERLP this would not outweigh the significant harm I have identified with regards to character and appearance.
15. The proposal would conflict with the development plan as a whole and there are no other considerations, including the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework, which outweigh this finding.
16. Therefore, for the reasons given above, the appeal should be dismissed.

Chris Baxter

INSPECTOR