



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 January 2025 by J Reed MPlan

Decision by B Plenty BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 31st March 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/U2750/W/24/3352390

May-Zac, Church Street, Well, North Yorkshire DL8 2QA

- 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 Tom Dunnington against the decision of North Yorkshire Council.
 - The application Ref is ZB24/00627/FUL.
 - The development proposed is new "L" shaped building one and half storey traditionally built, for garaging and storage at ground floor level and an annex and home office at first floor level.
-

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 host dwelling and the area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal site is situated within the settlement of Well, with Church Street forming a linear pattern of development out to its eastern side. There is an existing detached annex to the rear of the dwelling. There is a clear hierarchy of scale found in the relationship of the dwelling to its annex behind. As such, the visual dominance of the dwelling, and the subservience of the existing outbuilding, contribute to a pleasant traditional configuration of rural buildings, within a wide plot. The ordered scale of buildings on site and the sense of openness around the dwelling make a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the area.
5. The proposed outbuilding would be sited alongside the dwelling. It would have a large footprint and be close to the highway. Due to its scale and siting, it would dominate the plot and unbalance the established relationship between the dwelling, its subordinate outbuilding and the open space to its side. Due to its relatively exposed location, and proximity to Church Street, the proposal would appear as a dominant and bulky feature that would relate poorly to the existing buildings within the site. The proposed building would be of proportions that would intimate a building of agrarian character, but this would contrast negatively with the modern architectural composition of the existing buildings within the site.

6. I acknowledge that the appeal building would utilise traditional materials and fenestration which would be typical for a rural building in a countryside setting. However, the proportions, footprint and proximity to Church Street of the proposed building would erode the positive characteristics of the site. As such, it would not be visually subordinate to, or commensurate with, the host dwelling and would be visually incongruous with adjacent development. Furthermore, the proposal would harmfully contrast with the modern design of the dwelling and its outbuilding.
7. I observed on my site visit that there is a linear pattern of development to the northside of Church Street. I acknowledge that previously a sense of openness would have been apparent to the east of the site. However, as a result of the recently approved, and now partly constructed, dwelling adjacent to the appeal site this sense of openness has been eroded, to an extent that the gap has been mostly infilled. Accordingly, the appeal site and adjacent residential plot no longer make a strong contribution of the openness of the village. Consequently, built form in this location in principle, would not look out of place nor would it materially impact on any sense of openness. Given the pattern of development I do not find that material harm would be caused by the placement of proportionate development within the plot.
8. Although I have found that the proposal would not result in the loss of an important gap, this absence of harm would be a neutral factor in the planning balance. However, due to its scale and proximity to Church Street, the proposal would be a prominent feature within this rural setting causing significant harm to the character and appearance of the site and its surroundings. Consequently, the proposed development would conflict with Policy E1 of the Hambleton Local Plan (2022) which requires development to integrate successfully with its surroundings and to contribute positively to the local character in terms of its scale, layout and height.

Other Matters

9. I appreciate the appellant's need for more storage on site following the conversion of the previous garage to an annex. However, this represents a private gain to the appellant, and it has not been sufficiently demonstrated that the scale of the appeal scheme is necessary to achieve this objective. I therefore give this matter limited weight in favour of the proposal.
10. The appellant has outlined the possibility of including various conditions to an approval in order to limit the building's use and to secure its association with the dwelling on the appeal site. However, the imposition of such conditions, even if necessary, would not address the harm I have identified in regard to the main issue.

Conclusion and Recommendation

11. The proposal would not accord with the development plan, when taken as a whole, and there are no material considerations of sufficient magnitude to indicate that the appeal should be determined other than in accordance with the development plan.
12. I therefore recommend that the appeal should 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.

Ben Plenty

INSPECTOR