



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 February 2023

by M J Francis BA (Hons) MA MSc MCIfA

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13 April 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/N2739/W/22/3309788

Little Hinny, York Road, Barlby, Selby, North Yorkshire YO8 5JZ

- 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 Jack Small against the decision of Selby District Council.
 - The application Ref 2022/0674/COU, dated 6 June 2022, was refused by notice dated 30 September 2022.
 - The development proposed is 2no temporary caravans.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The two caravans were on the site at the time of my visit. It is reputed that they have been there since 2019.

Main Issue

3. The main issues are:
 - The effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the countryside; and
 - Whether it would be a suitable location for the proposal and contribute to the local economy and vitality of the rural community.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. The site is within a small cluster of dwellings and agricultural buildings to the north of the village of Barlby, close to the A19. It is located in the open countryside within a flat area dominated by agricultural fields.
5. The entrance to the site has high, black gates, attached to substantial brick pillars. Internally, the site is bounded by vertical timber fencing. Around this, hedging is located along some of the boundaries.
6. The caravans are visible, in part, from adjoining properties and from the adjacent York Road and the A19. However, because of the high entrance to the site, and hedging along the front, only the roof and top of the caravans, are visible from public vantage points.
7. A stable had previously been located within the site, but this had been demolished by the time of my visit. I saw that there was an area of hardcore

stretching from the entrance and used as a driveway, and piles of rubble and building materials. The caravans sit adjacent to this and so do not appear incongruous amongst the other general materials and clutter within the site. The caravans, therefore, do not harmfully change the general character of the site. Furthermore, they are enclosed by the high boundaries around the site. This means that the limited views afforded of them does not result in harm to the character and appearance of the countryside in this location.

8. The proposal would accord with Policies SP18 and SP19 of Selby District Core Strategy Local Plan (CS), 2013, plus Policy ENV1 of the Selby Local Plan Part 1- General Policies, 2005. These policies collectively seek to ensure that development has regard to the effect on the landscape and the character of an area.

Suitable location

9. Policy SP2A (c) of the CS says that 'development in the countryside will be limited to the replacement or extension of existing buildings, the re-use of buildings preferably for employment purposes, and well-designed new buildings of an appropriate scale, which would contribute towards and improve the local economy and where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities; or meet rural affordable housing need, or other special circumstances.'
10. The caravans are stated to be temporary structures for workforce welfare facilities, storage of materials and occasional living accommodation for the workforce in relation to the construction of a new dwelling on the site.
11. Although I saw some building materials, there is no particular evidence that the new dwelling was under construction. Whilst the convenience of occasionally living on site during building operations is appreciated, no details have been provided as to the length of time that the caravans are intended to be there, or any indication of the proposed timescale for the building of the house.
12. While the appellant sees no need for temporary caravans to contribute to and improve the local economy, Policy SP2A (c) makes no such exception. Moreover, it has not been shown how the proposal is for any of the stated developments that are acceptable under the Policy within the Countryside. Consequently, the proposal would not accord with SP2A (c) of the CS.

Conclusion

13. The proposed development conflicts with the development plan when considered as a whole and there are no material considerations that outweigh the identified harm and associated development plan conflict.
14. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal is dismissed.

M J Francis

INSPECTOR