



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 July 2025

by F Harrison BA(Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12 September 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/E2001/W/25/3366394

Model Farm, Out Newton Road, Out Newton, East Yorkshire HU19 2RE

- 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 Ms Cathy Thomas against the decision of East Riding of Yorkshire Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/03662/PLF.
 - The development proposed is the conversion of agricultural buildings to 2no. holiday accommodation units.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. Since the Council's decision, the East Riding Local Plan Update 2020-2039 (2025) (LP) and the East Riding Design Code (2025) (DC) have been adopted. The appellant has had the opportunity to comment on the relevant policies identified by the Council which supersede those listed on the decision notice, and the provisions of the DC which is a supplementary planning document (SPD).

Main Issues

3. The main issues are:
 - whether the proposal is in a suitable location, having regard to the Council's spatial strategy; and
 - the effect of the proposal on highway safety, with regard to access and car parking.

Reasons

Location

4. The appeal site accommodates the eastern wing of an agricultural building and part of the field adjacent to it. It lies in a predominantly agricultural landscape where the character and appearance of the rural area comprises an open expanse of agricultural fields with sporadic dwellings and farm buildings.
5. It is not disputed that the appeal site falls outside the development limits of the nearest settlement and is regarded as the countryside. In such locations, under LP Policy S4, development will be supported to help maintain the countryside where, amongst other things, it is of an appropriate scale to its location taking into account the need to support sustainable patterns of development. Also of relevance to this

appeal is section D which supports the conversion of buildings for tourism where it would re-use a redundant or disused building without significant alteration or extension, where the proposal respects the intrinsic character of its surroundings.

6. The proposal would not involve significant extension of the agricultural building. However, to facilitate the change of use, three generously sized windows would be inserted on the eastern elevation and the existing field adjacent to the building would be used to provide two amenity areas bounded by a brick wall, and an area for car parking and manoeuvring for access. As a consequence of these features, the proposal would have a distinctly domestic appearance, at odds with what might reasonably be expected to be found within an agricultural setting. As such, the proposal would appear as an alien feature in the rural context of the locality. In doing so, it would not respect the intrinsic character of the surroundings as required by LP Policy S4 and would not secure a well designed place as sought by the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework).
7. The amenity areas are modest in size and the boundary walls around them would not be excessively tall so that the eastern part of the appeal site would retain a largely open character. The appellant also contends that domestic paraphernalia would be limited. However, in combination, the extent of the proposed changes would result in the site appearing very different to its existing agricultural character and would contribute to a small, but nevertheless harmful, encroachment of built form. Even if the 'grasscrete' provided a lasting green surface to the eastern part of the plot, its use for domestic purposes would erode the character of the site. Given the general absence of structured hedging the proposed hawthorn hedges would do little to mitigate the visual effects of the proposal.
8. While the domestic alterations and features on the eastern part of the site would be screened by the existing agricultural buildings from the west and north, there would be clear views on approach from the south. Owing to the generally flat topography of the surrounding area with limited hedgerows, I observed prolonged views of the appeal site when travelling along a large section of Out Newton Road which is relatively straight on approach to the appeal site. In these views the visual change and urbanising effect of the proposal would appear jarring against the wider backdrop of the open countryside. Even in oblique views, the large windows would be a particular focal point, including when it is dark as there is little guarantee that blinds or curtains would be closed to prevent light spill which would draw the eye in this rural location.
9. There are also several public rights of way (PROW) in the vicinity of the appeal site, which would afford long and short distance views of the proposal, from which the visual intrusion of the features on the eastern part of the site would be readily apparent. In particular, there would be direct views of the prominent glazed openings, not typical of an agricultural building which would be visible above the proposed boundary wall. By detracting from the prevailing character and appearance of the area the proposal would diminish the enjoyment of the PROW by its users.
10. Historic mapping appears to show that the field to the east of the agricultural building has historically been enclosed and has included a traditional stone wall at the roadside. However, as the field is said to have been used in conjunction with the agricultural use of the buildings, any boundary treatment would not have

harmed the character and appearance of the area in the same way that the appeal scheme would. This matter does not therefore alter my above findings.

11. Recognising that sustainable transport solutions will vary between urban and rural areas, opportunities for sustainable travel patterns to and from the site would be limited. Despite the site's proximity to several PROWs, bridleways and cycle routes there is limited detailed evidence to suggest that visitors would not generally be reliant on the private car. While there may be excellent links to a main road, there are no footpaths on the local roads which are also unlit. Walking to services and facilities would therefore not be along an attractive route.
12. Even if a condition was imposed to restrict the occupancy of the proposal, and notwithstanding that the Framework supports rural tourism development which may be in locations that are not well served by public transport, in these circumstances development must be sensitive to its surroundings and respect the character of the countryside. That would not be the case for the appeal scheme.
13. To conclude on this main issue, the proposal would not be in a suitable location, having regard to the Council's spatial strategy and would be in conflict with LP Policies S4 and ENV1. Amongst other things, these policies require proposals in the countryside to support sustainable patterns of development and achieve a high quality of design that contributes to a sense of place and beauty and protects the intrinsic character of its surroundings.

Highway safety

14. Access to the appeal site would be from Out Newton Road, a relatively flat, unlit, 60 miles per hour road that, in parts, is not wide enough for two vehicles and has intermittent passing places. Owing to the scale of the proposal, it would not generate such an increase in traffic movements that there would be a severe residual cumulative impact on the road network, and vehicles are said to be able to enter and exit the site in a forward gear.
15. Nevertheless, the proposed access would be proximate to a bend in the road. While the appellant asserts that there would be excellent visibility, this has not been substantiated in evidence. I observed the visibility splays at the proposed access to be free from any tall vegetation, however the distance of the splays is limited by the configuration of the road and I have no clear evidence to indicate that they would be appropriate in the circumstances of the appeal site.
16. Even if cars on Out Newton Road would not be travelling at the maximum permitted speed given the configuration of the road at the appeal site location, there is no detailed evidence to show what speed vehicles would be travelling and so I am unable to determine whether or not satisfactory visibility in either direction would be achieved. Consequently, it has not been shown that the proposed access would be safe and would not result in the potential for conflict between users. Adopting the precautionary approach, and in the absence of sufficient evidence to the contrary, the proposal would have an unacceptable impact on highway safety and would not meet the provisions of Framework Paragraph 116.
17. While the two recorded incidents nearby were 'slight', they were on a straighter section of the road and where there is not an access, as such it does not indicate that the appeal scheme would be inherently safe. Furthermore, the proposal would appear to result in the loss of a designated passing place, increasing the risk of

conflict between road uses on this narrow section of the road. The plans show the insertion of a gate on the roadside at the existing access, details of which could be secured through the imposition of a planning condition to ensure an appropriate barrier given the proximity to the road.

18. The plans show only one bedroom per unit, however there is space in each unit for two occupants. There are no relevant parking standards for holiday accommodation, and the scheme proposes one space per unit. No provision is made within the site for any additional parking should the occupants travel in separate cars. While this may be an unlikely occurrence, any displacement additional parking on the road, no matter how infrequent, would exacerbate the potential for conflict between road users given the site's context. Even if a condition was imposed to restrict the occupancy of the proposal for holiday purposes the highway safety concerns highlighted above would remain.
19. In conclusion, the proposal would have an unacceptable effect on highway safety, with regard to access and car parking. It would be in conflict with LP Policies C1, ENV1, EC4 and S8 which amongst other things require proposals to be adequately serviced by transport infrastructure, promoting safe movement for all and minimising highway safety risks so that people and places are well connected.

Other Matters

20. Although there would be no significant consequences for ecology, and satisfactory biodiversity net gain and drainage would be achieved, these matters, and any other policy compliance, including living conditions, are neutral factors which weigh neither for nor against the appeal scheme.
21. The appeal site lies within the zone of influence for the Humber Estuary Special Area of Conservation, Special Protection Area and Ramsar Site, afforded protection under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (as amended) (the Regulations). The Regulations require that permission may only be granted after having ascertained that the development would not affect the integrity of a designated habitat. However, as the scheme is unacceptable for other reasons, it is not necessary for me to consider the implications of the proposal upon the protected sites.

Conclusion

22. My above findings bring the proposal into conflict with the development plan, read as a whole. There are no material considerations that indicate a decision should be made other than in accordance with it. Therefore, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

F Harrison

INSPECTOR