



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 July 2025

by **L Wilson BA (Hons) MA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 31st July 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/E2001/W/25/3360509

Land to the east of Enholmes Farm, Enholmes Lane, Patrington, Hull HU12 0PR

- 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 and Mrs Theaker against the decision of East Riding of Yorkshire Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/00941/PLF.
 - The development proposed was described on the application form as construct a small stable block and manure clamp on a concrete base, provide an area of permeable stone for access and turning. Change of use to equestrian.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. Since the application was determined, the Council has adopted the East Riding Local Plan Strategy Document Update 2025 (ERLP SDU) and the East Riding Design Code Supplementary Planning Document (ERDC). The main parties were able to comment on this matter during the appeal process.
3. The development has been carried out. However, it is clear from the evidence before me that the development is not in complete accordance with the submitted plans. For the avoidance of doubt, I have assessed the appeal proposal and based my decision on the plans before me, and this is reflected in the tense used in my decision.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the local area bearing in mind the special attention that should be paid to the desirability of preserving the setting of the nearby Grade II listed buildings at the Enholmes model farmstead.

Reasons

5. Policy S4 of the ERLP SDU sets out the requirements for development proposals to be supported in countryside locations. Part D. of the policy lists a number of forms of development that would be supported in the countryside where proposals respect the intrinsic character of their surroundings. This includes equine development.
6. Towards the west of the appeal site are eight Grade II listed buildings at the Enholmes model farmstead. As the proposal relates to the setting of listed

buildings, I have had special regard to section 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the Act).

7. The listed buildings consist of two separate implement sheds, engine house/ granary range and adjoining barn, a cattle house range, a stable range, a cart shed/ granary range, a laundry and a manure shed. Enholmes Farm is a rare example of a Victorian model farm built around 1849 and is a good example of an early industrial farm.
8. The listed buildings have now been sympathetically converted to residential use. They vary in scale and are a mix of single and two-storey buildings. The conversion of the Enholmes Farm complex has domesticated the site compared to its original use. Nonetheless, the buildings continue to form a uniform group with consistent use of materials. They are constructed from orange-brown brick with orange rubbed-brick dressings, pantile roof and cream coloured windows.
9. The flat, open and undeveloped countryside setting, interspersed with mature tree belts and hedgerows, contribute to the setting of the listed buildings and their special interest. More recently built dwellinghouses, domestic paraphernalia, and fencing also form part of the setting of the listed buildings.
10. The site has historic connections to Shire horses and the “horselads” of the county that operated on the site when the model farm was in operation. Furthermore, the appellant highlights that there was a building which was used in connection with the Enholmes farm complex and the breeding of working horses. Having said that, the evidence before me indicates that the former building was much smaller in size and was located in a less prominent location within the trees.
11. The proposal would re-introduce animals and animal husbandry to the paddock. However, horses that were previously kept on the site of Enholmes Farm would have been part of the working farm and would have been associated with the agricultural use of the farmstead. Shire Horses are renowned for their size and strength and have been traditionally chosen for farming as a result of their abilities to pull carts, plough fields, and transport large loads. Additionally, the comings and goings associated with the development, whilst not significant, would be different to that associated with the working farm complex. Thus, the proposed development cannot be directly compared to the historic use of the site.
12. The plans and description of the development described in the application form include an access track, and a parking/turning area. As a result of the siting within the open setting of the Enholmes model farmstead, and scale of the development, the proposal would change the visual appearance of the area, and setting of the listed buildings as a result of the built-form and associated paraphernalia, and would undermine how the listed buildings are appreciated.
13. When approaching the site from Patrington direction, the development would be in view and would stand out on approaching the buildings that make up the Enholmes model farmstead. The development would sit within the open setting and would erode the open and undeveloped setting of the listed buildings.
14. The building would be adjacent to the treeline and the farm complex is the centre of the view when approaching from Patrington direction. Nonetheless, from this viewpoint, it would be the only clearly visible building that would not form part of the Enholmes Farm complex and would appear at odds with the uniform group of

buildings. The recently planted trees would take a significant number of years to become well established and to provide meaningful screening. The materials do not reflect that of the nearby listed buildings, but they are muted with the backdrop of mature trees and in any event, materials could be addressed by a planning condition.

15. For the reasons set out above, I find that the proposal would fail to preserve the special interest setting of the listed buildings and would not respect the intrinsic character of the surroundings. Paragraph 212 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) advises that when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation. Paragraph 213 goes on to advise that any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset (from its alteration or destruction, or from development within its setting), should require clear and convincing justification.
16. Given the historic associations with horses, previous building and domestication of the area, I find the harm to be less than substantial in this instance. Within the less than substantial categorisation, the amount of harm would be at the lower end of the spectrum. Nonetheless, mindful of my statutory duties, this is a matter to which I attach considerable importance and weight. Under such circumstances, paragraph 215 of the Framework advises that this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal, including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use.
17. The appellant is of the opinion that the proposal would be beneficial because the proposed use injects equine life back into the land surrounding the farm, and the stables would ensure that the site is upkeep properly. Furthermore, they state that the use of the land for horses and the associated high quality and high levels of welfare will help to reestablish lost historic links which will benefit the public's interpretation of Enholmes model farm and its important equestrian links for the area. However, the benefits are not sufficient to outweigh the harm that I have identified to the listed buildings.
18. Given the above and in the absence of any defined significant public benefits, I conclude that, on balance, the proposal would fail to preserve the special historic interest setting of the Grade II listed buildings and would cause harm to the character and appearance of the local area. This would fail to satisfy the requirements of the Act, paragraph 215 of the Framework and conflict with Policies S4, ENV1 and ENV3 of the ERLP SDU and the ERDC. These seek, amongst other things, to ensure development proposals contribute to safeguarding and respecting the diverse character and appearance of the area, and development that will cause harm to the significance of a heritage asset will only be granted where clear and convincing justification for the proposed harm can be demonstrated in line with national planning policy requirements. As a result, the proposal would not be in accordance with the development plan.

Other Matters

19. In addition to matters relating to the main issue, a range of other matters have been highlighted by the appellant and local residents. Suggested planning conditions have been put forward and my attention has been drawn to the pre-application advice and comments at the planning committee. Furthermore, works

done have increased the biodiversity of the area, and benefit wildlife. It has also been stated that the development will add to the community, and investment to the area, and has stopped trespasses. However, the other matters raised do not outweigh the harm and conflict I have found.

Conclusion

20. For the reasons given above, having considered the development plan as a whole, the approach in the Framework, and all other material considerations, the appeal does not succeed.

L Wilson

INSPECTOR