



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 September 2024 by J Reed MPlan

Decision by Martin Seaton BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 9 May 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/U2750/D/24/3347436

**The Stable Barn, Loshpot Lane To Ingmanthorpe Grange And
Ingmanthorpe House Farm, Ingmanthorpe, North Yorkshire, LS22 5HL**

- 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 Justin Lynch against the decision of North Yorkshire Council.
 - The application Ref is ZC24/00633/FUL.
 - The development proposed is floor first extension above existing ground floor extension and increased opening to ground floor.
-

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 on the character and appearance of the host building and surrounding area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal building is one of a number of stone farm buildings situated at Ingmanthorpe House Farm, and which have been sympathetically converted into dwellings. The dwelling holds a linear two storey form which has been retained as part of the conversion. A single storey lean to extension has been added to the southern elevation perpendicular to the main long axis of the building and is clearly read as a later addition by virtue of its limited scale and roof design.
5. The proposed first floor extension would sit above the existing ground floor lean to extension and would incorporate a hipped roof, similar in appearance to the hipped roofs on the host building. Despite this similarity, the overall scale, form and design of the extension would result in a much more domestic appearance to the resultant building, contrary to the retained agricultural character of the converted host building. The introduction of a two-story element departing from the traditional linear form of the barn conversion, would unacceptably erode the agricultural character which the conversion of the barn so sympathetically sought to retain.

6. I recognise that the appellant has referred to the scale of the extension as being comparatively modest in the context of the host building. However, whilst in volumetric terms this may be the case, and although the first-floor extension would use broadly appropriate facing materials, these factors would not mitigate sufficiently the harm caused by the departure from the existing barns linear form. Furthermore, the domestic character is reinforced by the use of proposed UPVC windows, which would detract from the traditional architectural character of the host building.
7. The appellant has drawn my attention to the presence of the existing extension on the appeal property. However, this is small in scale, clearly read as a subservient and later addition by virtue of its modest proportions and differing roof design to the main building.
8. For the reasons as set out, the proposed first floor extension would have an adverse effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and area. As such it would fail to comply with Policies HP3 and HS8 of the Harrogate District Local Plan (2020) which requires development to be of high-quality design and compatible with the host property and the surrounding area.

Other Matters

9. Regarding the other examples referenced by the appellant, I have not been passed any significant detail of these extensions or the circumstances leading to their completion. From the photographic evidence alone, it is not possible to conclude that the form of the original buildings and their context and setting is of sufficient similarity to the appeal site. These submissions do not therefore alter my conclusions on the main issue.
10. I have also had regard to the private benefit referred to by the appellant in respect of the improvements to the quality and size of the accommodation for use by occupants. However, this would attract only very limited weight which would not outweigh the harm highlighted by the main issue.

Conclusion and Recommendation

11. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

J Reed

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

Martin Seaton

INSPECTOR