



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 July 2024 by L Clark MSc MRTPI

Decision by John Morrison BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26 July 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/U2750/D/24/3346256

The Paddock, Hull Road, Hemingbrough, Selby YO8 6QJ

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr R Finney against the decision of North Yorkshire Council.
 - The application Ref is ZG2024/0151/HPA.
 - The development proposed is described as the 'erection of a storage building.'
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal site is bordered by open fields within a distinctly rural setting. It is landscaped and the dwelling is set back a fair distance from the roadside with a large area of grassland between. The building is to be sited within the curtilage of the dwelling alongside its host. There is an existing detached outbuilding to the side of the dwelling, towards its rear. There is a clear and deliberate hierarchy to this scale relationship where the visual dominance of the primary building in the dwelling and the subservience of the existing outbuilding contribute to a pleasant traditionality. This is a positive aspect of the character and appearance of the area.
5. The proposed building would be large in both its land take and height. Due to its scale and proximity to the host dwelling, it would dominate the plot and unacceptably unbalance the established positive relationship between the dwelling and its subordinate buildings. The relatively exposed location and siting of the buildings within the plot would emphasise the awkwardness of this relationship to the detriment of the character and appearance of the area. A building of this style and materials would typically be seen in rural locations, and it would exude something of an agrarian feel. However, it would give rise to harm when placed in its intended context, as I have explained.

6. The proposed development would therefore conflict with Policies ENV1 and H14 of the Selby District Local Plan (2005) and Policy SP2 of the Selby District Core Strategy Local Plan (2013) which are concerned with protecting the character and appearance of the area amongst other things.

Other Matters

7. I appreciate the need for more storage and security on the appeal site having regard to the appellant's situation. However, it has not been sufficiently demonstrated that the appeal scheme is the sole way of achieving those objectives and other, potentially less harmful, methods could be explored. I therefore give this matter limited weight.
8. Whilst the Council do cite harm to the open countryside in their reasons for refusal and this forms the area as far as the wider context for the appeal site is concerned. The open countryside would remain so regardless of the outcome of the appeal. The proposed development would be contained entirely within an established residential curtilage. The harm I have found would relate, in the main, to the specifics of the plot itself.

Conclusion and Recommendation

9. For the reasons given above, the appeal scheme would conflict with the development plan and there are no material considerations worthy of sufficient weight that would indicate departing therefrom. I therefore recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

L Clark

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

10. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

John Morrison

INSPECTOR