
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 September 2025

by Alison Scott (BA Hons) Dip TP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22 September 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/U2750/W/25/3369239

Fieldfare Barn, Hutton Hill, Leyburn, Richmond DL8 5RN

- 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 Emily Armstrong against the decision of North Yorkshire Council.
 - The application Ref is ZD24/00685/FULL.
 - The development proposed is Bedroom and ensuite extension over existing rear offshot.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the local area, and effect upon the living conditions of adjacent occupants by way of overshadowing,

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The appeal property forms part of a former agricultural outbuilding converted into residential use. Fieldfare Barn is the middle dwelling within the conversion development. The conversion is characterful and traditional in appearance and still maintains a rural aesthetic, finished in stone with a natural slate roof over. All the dwellings have single storey rear returns and the rear faces onto the main road. The front elevation is largely hidden from street view.
4. The return element of the appeal site is shared equally with the attached dwelling of Hutton Hill Granary and symmetrical in appearance, with a single pitched roof over, sitting perpendicular and lower to the main roof, running in an east west direction. Above this return, a new bedroom with ensuite is proposed to extend the full length and width of their side of the return with a peaked gable end and roof linking into the main dwelling.
5. The conversion as a whole has a visible rhythm due to the rear return arrangement and a strong consistency and cohesion to the build form. An extension above the return would distort this rhythm as it would add an uncharacteristic first floor extension, and higher than the existing attached part of the neighbour's return. It would appear further incongruous due to its peaked gable end design and placement of first floor rear windows. It would no longer pair with the attached part of the adjoining return.

6. The existing single storey returns currently have a proportionality to their appearance. An extension above would significantly disrupt this proportionality, especially when seen in context with the wider conversion in public views from the south, appearing as a large, bulky and out of scale addition to the host dwelling. It would not enhance local character or distinctiveness.
7. The proposal would be seen as part and parcel of the conversion development when taken as a whole. It would detrimentally jar with the rhythm, symmetry and balance of the rear elevation of the houses. Therefore it would result in an adverse visual effect upon the character and appearance of the host dwelling and wider conversion development.
8. On this basis, the proposal would not accord with the design aims of policies CP3, CP8 and CP13 of the Richmondshire Local Plan 2012-2028 Core Strategy. Furthermore, it would not respect the design principles within the National Planning Policy Framework.

Living conditions

9. The attached The Granary is positioned to the south of the appeal site within its own independent grounds with a wraparound garden/outdoor space of a sizable nature. The existing space would be retained between the party boundary and the proposed extension. Hutton Hill Granary is located to the north of the appeal site. The occupants currently experience some overshadowing of their garden as a result of this dwelling.
10. Whilst the proposal would cause some overshadowing to both neighbouring dwellings, I am not convinced that the increased bulk would result in a significantly greater effect upon these dwellings by way of overshadowing than currently exists.
11. Therefore, the proposal would not cause an adverse impact on the living conditions of the adjacent occupants. It thus complies with the broad amenity aims of policy CP3 of the Richmondshire Local Plan 2012-2028 Core Strategy.

Balance

12. I have concluded that the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the barn conversion development as a whole. There would be no significantly adverse effect upon the living conditions of the adjacent occupants by way of overshadowing. Be that as it may, my findings regarding effect of the proposal on character and appearance do not lead me to conclude positively on the proposal.

Conclusion

13. I have considered all matters that have been raised and conclude that the proposal would conflict with the development plan as a whole and there are no other material considerations which lead me to determine the appeal otherwise than in accordance with it. Therefore, for the reasons given, the appeal is dismissed.

Alison Scott

INSPECTOR