



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 August 2025

by **C Skelly BA (Hons) MSc MA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25 September 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/E2001/W/25/3367401

White House, Sledmere Road, Fimber, East Riding of Yorkshire YO25 9LY

- 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 Smith against the decision of East Riding of Yorkshire Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/02029/PLF.
 - The development proposed is change of use of former coach house to form a self-contained domestic annexe including replacement single storey extension to side following demolition of existing extensions to south and west sides.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The Council adopted the East Riding Local Plan Update 2025-2039 (LP) in April 2025 after its refusal of planning permission. This supersedes the previous East Riding Local Plan that was adopted in 2016. In these circumstances, I am required to determine the appeal against the current development plan for the area at the time of my decision. The appeal has therefore been determined in accordance with Policy S4 of the LP.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is whether the proposal is an appropriate form of development in a rural location having regard to the spatial development strategy.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is an outbuilding currently used for storage which is located to the rear of White House, a detached dwelling with extensive rear garden. The site is located on the edge of the village of Fimber. The outbuilding is brick-built with a pantile pitched roof with two timber lean-to extensions. These lean-to extensions run to the eaves height of the brick-built element and are in poor condition. The extensive garden associated with the dwelling is split into sections by hedges and fencing. The outbuilding is separated from the dwelling by approximately 25m and is enclosed by high hedging and a fence, which visually divides it from the more formal garden area which adjoins the dwelling. The outbuilding is accessed via a driveway which runs along the side of the dwelling.
5. The site is not located within a defined development limit as set out in the Settlement Network of the East Riding Local Plan Update 2020-2039 (2025) (LP) and therefore is considered as 'countryside' for the purposes of development. Policy S4 seeks to restrict new housing development in such locations unless it

accords with specific provisions. Part D of Policy S4 states that proposals for the conversion of existing buildings for new housing in the countryside will be supported where the preservation of the building would re-use a redundant or disused building without significant alteration or significant extension. The intention of Policy S4 is to direct development to areas where there are services, facilities, homes and jobs and are served by the most sustainable modes of transport.

6. The proposed annexe would comprise two bedrooms, kitchen, bathroom and lounge area. This would be provided by replacing the timber side extensions with a single pitched roof wing, which would have a larger footprint than the existing brick-built element. Whilst the overall footprint of the proposal would be smaller than the totality of existing structures, the replacement wing would be much higher than the existing timber elements and have a much greater scale and massing. Overall, the proposal would, in my view constitute significant alterations to the outbuilding. The proposal would therefore not meet the requirements of Policy S4 D 1) ii.
7. The proposal would allow the appellant to move into the annexe and for younger members of the family to move into the main house to provide an element of care, whilst enabling them to live independently to a considerable degree. Although vehicle access would be via a shared driveway, the annexe would have generous living accommodation, would not share facilities with the main house and would be a self-contained unit, which is physically separated from the main dwelling by some distance. The submitted plans do not indicate that there would be a clear and functional link to the main dwelling. Thereby, it is conceivable that day-to-day living could be carried out without any reliance on the main household. Permission is sought for a self-contained unit and therefore I find that the proposal could not reasonably be considered as an annexe and that it would provide accommodation that would operate as a separate and independent dwelling.
8. The appellant contends that the extensive gardens would be a shared amenity, however these gardens are already subdivided by landscaping. Although there is currently access between the separate parts of the garden this could be easily separated in the future.
9. The appellant refers to the requirement for single storey accommodation, more regular support, the involvement of the East Yorkshire Occupational Therapy team and adaptations which have been provided to the main dwelling. However, no specific details of the appellant's requirements or why they cannot be met by other means without the proposed annexe have been submitted. Although I give the personal circumstances of the appellant significant weight, I am mindful that the situation may evolve over time, and the proposed annexe would be a permanent feature that is large enough to function as an independent dwelling.
10. The appellant has suggested that a condition could be applied to prevent future separation of the annexe from the main dwelling. However, as the proposed development is for a self-contained unit, a condition to link its use to the main dwelling would not be reasonable or necessary as required by Paragraph 57 of the National Planning Policy Framework.
11. The appellant has referred me to housing development, which is taking place in the village of Wetwang, located 3 miles away. This village is defined as a Rural Service Centre in the LP where new residential development is supported and

therefore is not comparable to the village of Fimber where such development is restricted. Reference has also been made to the development at Friar's Garth, however I have not been provided with the full details of this case, nor the circumstances in which permission was granted. Therefore, I cannot be certain that this case is directly comparable to the appeal case.

12. Whilst I note that there have been no objections to the proposal, the absence of objection does not in itself render the scheme acceptable.
13. In conclusion, I do not consider that the proposal would comprise an annexe which would be part and parcel of the existing dwellinghouse and therefore would constitute an independent dwelling. The proposal would therefore be an inappropriate form of development in a rural location having regard to the spatial development strategy. It thereby conflicts with Policy SP4 of the LP, which seeks amongst other things to restrict new housing in the countryside.

Conclusion

14. The proposal conflicts with the development plan and the material considerations do not indicate that the appeal should be decided other than in accordance with it.
15. For the reasons given above the appeal should be dismissed.

C Skelly

INSPECTOR