



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 November 2024 by J Reed MPlan

Decision by M Russell BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11th February 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/U2750/D/24/3349194

Blossom Tree Farm, Bell Lane, Cawood, Selby YO8 3UB

- 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 Crickmore against the decision of North Yorkshire Council.
 - The application Ref is ZG2024/0123/HPA.
 - The development proposed is rear ground floor and first floor extension with demolition of existing porch.
-

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.

Procedural Matters

3. The planning application form included 'DART Engineers' under the applicant details. It has been clarified during the appeal that 'DART Engineers' were the previous agents acting on behalf of the property owner, Mr Crickmore. It has been confirmed by the current agent DPA Planning Limited that Mr Crickmore remains the owner of the property. Therefore, notwithstanding the details on the planning application form, the appeal has proceeded on the basis that Mr Crickmore is the appellant.
4. The planning application form states that the appeal property is 'Tile Bridge Farm'. However, the drawings and the Council's decision notice name the property as 'Blossom Tree Farm'. This is also the name given to the property on the appellant's appeal form. All other aspects of the address on the planning application form are consistent across the documents provided by the main parties. Therefore, in the interests of consistency the above banner heading refers to the property as 'Blossom Tree Farm'.

Main Issue

5. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

6. Blossom Tree Farm is set away from the nearest settlements and the prevailing surroundings are characterised by fields. It is evidently in the countryside for

decision making purposes. The evidence before me indicates the dwelling is a former agricultural worker's dwelling which has been extended over time. The elevation which faces Bell Lane is mainly single storey with a narrower two-storey gabled section. It has small windows and a porch of quaint proportions to its front elevation. The dwelling is finished in an assortment of red and white brick work with a red pantile roof. The dwelling's modest scale, irregular form and traditional detailing and materials give it a rustic aesthetic. Together with its position within spacious grounds with thick foliage boundary treatments to its external boundaries the existing dwelling has an understated presence which is sympathetic to the character of the countryside.

7. The policies referred to in the Council's decision include Saved Policy H14 of the Selby District Local Plan (2005) SDLP which includes that extensions outside defined development limits must result in a disproportionate addition over and above the size of the original dwelling. It is not clear what would constitute a disproportionate addition. Policy H14 pre-dates the Framework and disproportionate additions is not mentioned in the Framework in the context of development in the countryside. Nevertheless, insofar as Policy H14 requires that proposals are not visually dominant and that the design and materials of extensions are in keeping with their host and other buildings in the area, it is in general conformity with the Framework's design expectations.
8. Moreover, taken together with the other development plan policies referenced by the Council in its decision, the general thrust of these policies is consistent with the Framework's requirements to ensure that developments add to the overall quality of the area, are sympathetic to local character and recognise the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside.
9. Due to the substantial increase in footprint and massing, particularly at the first-floor level, the host dwelling's modest, irregular form would be subsumed by the extension. It would be a visually dominant addition with no break in the roof line. The considerable scale of the development would be compounded to the front elevation by the resultant twin-gables and the large contemporary entrance with heavily glazed first-floor detail above. Therefore, even accounting for the otherwise similar window proportions and matching materials, the extension would be an unsympathetic addition which would be at odds with the host dwelling's rustic aesthetic and its rural context.
10. I acknowledge that the development would not be highly visible from wider views due to the foliage surrounding the site. Even so, it would be seen in close up views such as through the site entrance where the development's unsympathetic design and bulk would be noticeable to passers-by who may be familiar with the area. In any case, limited public visibility does not obviate the need to achieve good design which is sympathetic to local character, and which recognises the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside.
11. I conclude, the proposed extension would result in significant harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and its surroundings. As such it would fail to comply with Policies H14 and ENV1 of the Selby District Local Plan (2005) and policy SP19 of the Selby District Core Strategy Local Plan (2013) which require, high quality design having regard to local character, identity and context of its surroundings including the open countryside, to ensure that extensions do not dominate visually and that the design and materials should

be in keeping with the character and appearance of the building and other buildings in the area.

Conclusion and Recommendation

12. The proposal would be contrary to the development plan and the material considerations in this instance do not indicate that a decision should be made other than in accordance with it. I therefore recommend the appeal be dismissed.

J Reed

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

M Russell

INSPECTOR