



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 June 2025

by J McEvoy CEng MICE CMILT FIHE MIEnvSc

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 29 October 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/W1850/W/25/3364030

Land at Packhouse, North-West of Glewstone Court Hotel, Glewstone, Herefordshire HR9 6AW

- 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 Andrew Jackson against the decision of Herefordshire Council.
 - The application Ref is 240069.
 - The development proposed is the conversion of Packhouse to one dwelling and associated works.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The appeal statement in paragraph 2.2 refers to the appeal building having a steel-framed roof structure. This description of the roof structure is not aligned with the description given in the structural appraisal report at paragraph 2.4, which describes the roof as being timber framed, and at paragraph 5.2, which refers to a timber-framed structure.
3. During my site visit, I observed that the roof structure was formed of timber roof trusses. For this appeal, I consider the description given in the structural appraisal report better explains the actual roof structure of the building.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is whether the development would accord with the spatial strategy for the provision of housing in rural areas, regarding whether the building to be reused is of permanent and substantial construction capable of conversion without major reconstruction and the location of the site.

Reasons

5. Regarding the proposals to convert the appeal building, the building is a former agricultural shed used in connection with orchards that once existed on the adjacent land. The building consists of a single-storey building featuring a shallow-pitched roof. It includes timber-framed walls and roof structure, all covered with corrugated steel sheeting. The appeal site is discreetly located on the edge of a field with its own vehicular access via a narrow, unpaved lane, which connects to the village of Glewstone to the southeast. The appeal site is characterised by open countryside on the edge of the village. The appeal site also lies within the Wye Valley National Landscape.

6. The Herefordshire Local Plan Core Strategy (2015) (CS) Policy RA3 states that, outside settlements, residential development will be restricted to proposals that meet one or more specified criteria. Test 4 of CS Policy RA3 relates to developments that would facilitate the re-use of redundant or disused building(s), provided they comply with CS Policy RA5 and contribute to the enhancement of their immediate surroundings. CS Policy RA5 aims to allow the re-use of redundant or disused buildings in rural regions, contingent upon several criteria. These criteria encompass, but are not limited to, design proposals respecting the character and significance of any disused building, ensuring that the buildings are of permanent and substantial construction suitable for conversion, and capable of accommodating the new use without the need for substantial alteration, extension, or ancillary buildings.
7. The proposed development would see the building kept at its single-storey height. The external appearance of the proposed dwelling would reflect the external appearance of the existing building, maintaining its low-key design.
8. The appeal building has fallen into disrepair in relation to its external cladding and the timber frame structure.
9. The information submitted includes a structural appraisal report (the report), which sets out that the appeal building in its current form is of permanent and substantial construction. The report is based on a visual inspection of the building and noted that aspects of the building were not accessible or visible at the time of the inspection, such as the whole of the external south elevation and part of the external east elevation.
10. The report identifies structural defects, distress, and corrosion to the building fabric. The report also finds structural defects and distress on the perimeter walls and foundations.
11. During my visit to the site, I observed the internal and external elements of the appeal building that are highlighted and discussed in the report. I observed that the current purpose of the building seems to be for storage.
12. Whilst on site, I noted several structural issues concerning the construction and condition of the former packhouse, as detailed in the report. They are:
 - exposed load bearing timbers displaying decay;
 - roof trusses exhibiting signs of distress, with noticeable deformation and settlement of the roof ridge line and slopes;
 - misuse of the roof structure with several scaffold poles stacked on the bottom chord of two timber roof trusses;
 - outward displacement of a timber studwork wall that supports the roof trusses.
13. The structure remains standing; however, I noted that temporary propping was in place for a damaged roof truss to avert any further structural failure of the truss or possible collapse of that section of the roof.
14. While the report notes that all existing temporary and some permanent remedial works undertaken to stabilise the existing timber-framed building structure would be removed or incorporated within the proposed conversion works, I have seen no

formal, detailed, and comprehensive design of a permanent repair or replacement solution setting out an appropriate methodology to rectify the specific structural concerns.

15. In paragraph 5.6, the report concludes that the existing building could be converted without major or complete reconstruction for habitable usage. I find, however, that the report does not provide sufficient and convincing information that the building structure is capable of being rectified without major or complete reconstruction. Without such detailed and authoritative information, I cannot conclude that the scope and scale of building works to address these structural issues would not require major or complete reconstruction. I find that the proposed works would not constitute a conversion of the existing building.
16. The preferred walking route from the appeal site to the centre of Glewstone village follows the path of an unpaved lane in a south-easterly direction to join a public road with a speed limit of 30mph. At the opposite end, the path connects to a public road where the national speed limit is in force. The walking route along the public road with a 30mph speed limit lacks pavement or step-off areas, and there are no designated safe crossing points. The narrow, unpaved rural lane lacks street lighting and passing places, which presents further challenges for pedestrians.
17. The highway authority did not raise any technical objections to the proposal but did note that the location of the development would not facilitate movements other than by private car. There would be a degree of difficulty for pedestrians accessing the village centre from the appeal site. I consider the lack of safe and convenient pedestrian access to be such that occupiers of the dwelling would be highly reliant on a private vehicle thus resulting in significant harm in terms of accessibility.
18. Taking these factors together the proposal would not accord with the spatial strategy for the provision of housing in rural areas. The building to be reused is not of permanent and substantial construction which significantly undermines the inherent benefits that would arise from the reuse of an existing building and would lead to a dwelling in a location where the occupiers would be highly reliant on a private vehicle. The development would not accord with CS Policies RA3, RA5 and MT1 which only supports the reuse of rural buildings where they are capable of conversion without major or complete reconstruction and promotes development where access to services can be achieved by means other than private motorised transport.

Planning balance and conclusion

19. It is reported that the 5-year housing supply is 3.06 years, as of January 2025 (Herefordshire Council, Five Year Housing Land Supply 2024-2029).
20. Regarding the harms of the proposal, I identified above that the proposal conflicts with CS policies supportive of retaining and converting dis-used or redundant rural buildings. This would significantly reduce the positive benefits of repurposing an existing rural building. Given the reliance on private vehicle use, there would be adverse environmental and social impacts, which go against aspects of the Framework. I have given this matter significant negative weight.
21. Regarding the beneficial impacts, the proposal would make a small though positive contribution towards housing supply. The proposal would also provide small yet positive economic and social impacts by introducing a new dwelling, which could

potentially bolster local businesses and the rural economy, and contribute to the social well-being of the countryside.

22. I have considered Paragraph 61 of National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), which seeks to significantly boost the supply of homes. I have also considered Paragraph 73 of the Framework, which recognises the important contribution of small sites in meeting the housing requirements of the area. Considering the scope of the proposal, these benefits would be very modest.
23. In terms of the Framework, the inability of the local authority to demonstrate a five-year housing land supply triggers the "tilted balance." This means the presumption in favour of sustainable development applies, and permission should be granted unless the adverse impacts significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits.
24. When assessed against the policies in the Framework, I find that the adverse impacts of the proposed development would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits.
25. The proposal would conflict with the development plan when considered as a whole and the material considerations, including the application of paragraph 11 of the Framework, do not indicate that the appeal should be decided other than in accordance with it. This leads me to conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

J McEvoy

INSPECTOR