
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 June 2025

by **F P Tinsley MA (Hons) MBA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21 August 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/U2750/W/25/3362541

Eastfield Court, Ryther Road, Ulleskelf, Tadcaster, LS24 9DY

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Graham Glynn of Product Safety against the decision of North Yorkshire Council.
 - The application reference is Ref ZG/2024/1026/FUL.
 - The development proposed is described as ‘erection of a barn to store agricultural machinery and site solar panels.’
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are:
 - whether the location is suitable for the proposed development, with regard to the Council’s spatial strategy; and
 - the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

Suitability of the location

3. Eastfield Court is a large detached house set in extensive grounds adjacent to the River Wharf. The appeal site forms part of the wider land holding, outside of the residential/domestic curtilage. It lies outside the defined development limits of the settlement of Ulleskelf, as set out in the Selby District Core Strategy 2013 (the Core Strategy). A former boiler house building adjacent to the site, is currently used to store equipment used for the management and maintenance of the landholding.
4. Core Strategy Policy SP2 restricts development in the countryside to specific categories, including: the replacement or extension of existing buildings; the re-use of buildings, preferably for employment purposes; and new buildings of appropriate scale that are well-designed and contribute towards the local economy, enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities, and are in accordance with other development plan policies.

5. The proposal would not be the replacement, extension or re-use of a building. It would not be for employment purposes or commercial use nor would it be a new dwelling. Notwithstanding the construction period, there is little evidence that it would contribute towards the local economy or enhance or maintain the vitality of a rural community. Consequently, it does not meet any of the Core Strategy Policy SP2 exceptions relating to development in the countryside.
6. I understand that there are limitations on the former boiler house in terms of equipment and machinery storage. However, there is little substantive information before me in relation to the appellant's land holding and the management operations and machinery required for the maintenance of the land at Eastfield Court. Therefore, I cannot be certain that the proposed barn would be strictly proportionate and necessary in connection with the management of this land.
7. My attention has been drawn to development in the wider area, including a diversity of land uses. However, the surrounding development pattern does not provide a justification for a new building that would not demonstrably be of an appropriate scale nor contribute positively to the local economy or community.
8. Therefore, I conclude that the location is not suitable for the proposed development. Accordingly, the proposal conflicts with Core Strategy Policy SP2, as it does not fall within the categories of development deemed acceptable in the countryside.

Character and Appearance

9. The surrounding area comprises a relatively flat landscape characterised by a mix of land uses, including agricultural, horticultural and residential development. There is no prevailing architectural style or consistent pattern of development. Development in the vicinity is generally limited in scale and partly screened by mature vegetation. Nevertheless buildings, particularly those over single storey in height, are visible from various vantage points across the wider landscape. A large and attractive pond adjacent to the appeal site provides a notable feature and contributes to the sense of openness.
10. The barn would be a substantial rectangular building with a large footprint exceeding six metres in height. It would have a utilitarian, industrial appearance typical of commercial or agricultural sheds. By virtue of its scale massing and design, it would contrast markedly with the more modestly scaled development in the surrounding area.
11. Owing to its height and overall form, the barn would be a prominent structure within the landscape. It would be seen in juxtaposition with the adjacent former boiler house, and the cumulative visual impact of the two buildings would significantly diminish the area's open character. This would arise as the close siting of the buildings would create a conspicuous linear built form. Although mature vegetation would offer some screening, the barn would extend above much of this vegetation and remain highly visible, particularly in views from the north. Vegetation is any case temporary and it cannot therefore be relied upon to screen development from view or mitigate adverse visual impacts.
12. For these reasons, I conclude that the proposed development would harm the rural character and appearance of the area. It would therefore be contrary to saved Policy ENV1 of the Selby District Local Plan 2005 (the Local Plan) and Policy

SP19 of the Core Strategy, which together require that development respects local character and identity, achieves high-quality design, and responds appropriately to its context. It would also conflict with the aims of the Framework, including in relation to development being sympathetic to landscape setting and recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside.

Other Considerations

13. The appellant contends that the appeal site constitutes brownfield land. Notwithstanding the adjacent boiler house and taking into account the planning history of the site, there is little substantive evidence that the appeal site constitutes previously developed land for the purposes of the Framework. Therefore, the Framework policies that support the effective use of land carry little weight in favour of the scheme.
14. There is little evidence that there are no alternate means to securely store the necessary equipment without the harm that I have found. There is also little evidence in relation to the ecological value of the land or that it would not be managed, or that its biodiversity value would in any case decline, in the absence of the proposal. Accordingly, these matters carry very limited weight in favour of the appeal.
15. The solar panels would contribute to energy efficiency and the climate change adaptation aims of the Framework more widely. However, while this may be a significant private benefit, there is little evidence that it would be any more than a limited public benefit. Therefore, this carries limited weight in favour of the proposal.
16. The appellant submits that planning conditions could be imposed that the building is only used for storage of garden and agricultural equipment; and not used for commercial purposes. They also suggest that the appearance of the building could be amended. Restricting the use of the barn would not address the harm I have found with regard to the suitability of the location for the proposed development and character and appearance of the area. Furthermore, no amended plans have been provided to illustrate an alternate design of the barn, such that I cannot be satisfied the adverse visual impact could be adequately mitigated by scheme amendments.

Conclusion

17. For the reasons set out above, I conclude that the proposal would conflict with the development plan and there are no material considerations that would outweigh that conflict. Therefore, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed

F P Tinsley

INSPECTOR