



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 September 2023

**by Caroline Mulloy BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI**

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

**Decision date: 03 October 2023**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/G2713/W/23/3320325**

**Longbeck Farm, Stokesley, North Yorkshire TS9 5LD**

- 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 S Dawson against the decision of Hambleton District Council.
  - The application Ref 22/02775/FUL, dated 1 December 2022, was refused by notice dated 30 January 2023.
  - The development proposed is construction of a detached garage and playroom.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Main Issue

2. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

### Reasons

3. The appeal site is an enclosed parcel of land situated on a wider private gypsy site at Longbeck Farm around 70m south of the A172. The appeal site itself comprises of one caravan/chalet which the appellant and his family occupy alongside a summerhouse, decking area and outhouse. A timber structure was also in the process of being constructed as a home gym at the time of my site visit. The appeal site is enclosed north and west by a fence and a hedge.
4. The wider site is comprised of timber and corrugated sheet buildings some of which appear to be in use as kennels. Caravans were situated on the field to the east of the site. The site is clearly separated from the built-up area of Stokesley by intervening fields. Overall, the area has an open and rural character.
5. The proposal is for the construction of a detached one and a half storey building to the north of the existing caravan/chalet. It would comprise of a large double garage on the ground floor and a playroom on the first floor. The proposed building would be of significant mass and bulk and would be taller than the single storey caravan/chalet. It would, therefore, be a disproportionate scale which would fail to appear subservient to the host property.
6. The appellant contends that the building would appear as a 'pseudo barn style' which would reflect the rural location of the appeal site. However, whilst it would have timber cladding to the upper walls, the pantile roof, rendered lower

walls, formal fenestration and roller shutter doors, would create a building of a distinctly urban appearance at odds with the rural character of the area.

7. I acknowledge that the proposed building would have approximately 4m high mature hedges to the north and west of the appeal site which would provide some screening. However, the ridge of the building would rise to 5.5m and would, therefore, be visible above the hedge. Whilst there are buildings to the north-east of the site, they are typical of farm buildings or caravans which would be expected to be found in a rural area. Overall, the proposal would fail to appear ancillary or subservient to the host property and would appear as an urban feature at odds with the rural and open character of the surrounding area.
8. In conclusion, the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the area. It would, therefore, conflict with Policies S1, S5 and E1 of the Hambleton Local Plan (2022), which collectively seek to achieve high quality, sustainable development which reinforces local distinctiveness and recognises the intrinsic beauty, character and distinctiveness of the countryside. Furthermore, the proposal would be contrary to paragraphs 126 and 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2021) which states that good design is a key aspect of sustainable development and that developments should be visually attractive as a result of good architecture.

### **Other matters**

9. Attention is drawn to a proposal for a new dwelling and 3 bay, two-storey outbuilding in Great Broughton. Whilst no details of the case have been provided, reference is made to the building being situated on the edge of the village. It is not, therefore, directly comparable to the appeal proposal which limits the weight I can attach to it in my decision.
10. The proposal would provide additional accommodation for the owner and their family, a factor to which I have attached moderate weight. However, this benefit would not outweigh the significant harm I have identified to the character and appearance of the area. The proposal would not harm the amenity of neighbouring occupiers or result in a loss of parking or garden/amenity areas; however, these are neutral factors in this case.

### **Conclusion**

11. The proposal would harm the character and appearance of the area and would be contrary to the Development Plan as a whole.

*Caroline Mulloy*

Inspector