



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 October 2025

by A Hickey MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 3rd December 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/F2415/W/25/3371322

Eastlongs Farm, Mowsley Lane, Walton, Leicestershire LE17 5RE

- 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 and Mrs S Kirk against the decision of Harborough District Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/00386/FUL.
 - The development proposed is erection of a dairy farm welfare unit.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. I have adopted the description of development as it appears on the decision notice and appeal form but removed the word 'retrospective' as this is superfluous and is not an act of development.
3. At the time of my site visit, I saw that the development had commenced, and that the building had been erected with external works appearing largely complete. The application made clear that the scheme was submitted retrospectively, and I have dealt with the appeal on that basis.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

5. Agricultural fields bound predominantly by hedgerows characterise the area surrounding the appeal site. Along Mowsley Lane, there are pockets of buildings on either side of the road which appear to include dwellings, agricultural buildings, outbuildings and barns, including those at the appeal site.
6. Nearby the appeal site is a large detached two-storey farmhouse and several large agricultural barns. Beyond the agricultural barns is a bungalow. The farmhouse is positioned close to the road and is accessed via a shared drive with the bungalow to the east. The appeal building and agricultural buildings are set back further than the farmhouse and are accessed via a separate drive to the west. The farmhouse has a traditional appearance with brick facades and a slate roof, while the barns have a utilitarian appearance with simple block and timber walls with a profiled clad roof.

7. The appeal building is constructed of materials similar to those of the farmhouse and incorporates multiple window and door openings. Its design features, including a porch, plinth detailing, double patio doors and brown uPVC fenestration, give it an entirely domestic appearance. Owing to its size, scale and appearance, the building, notwithstanding the appellant's view of its higher quality, does not read as an agricultural structure ancillary to the barns but instead as a domestic building more closely associated with the farmhouse. Consequently, it introduces a harmful element of urbanisation into the countryside, to the detriment of the surrounding rural setting.
8. I note an appeal¹ granted consent for a building in a similar location to the appeal scheme. However, based on the details before me, the building on site is longer, wider and taller. In addition, the design and materials of the previously approved appeal scheme appear to be more complementary and in keeping with the existing on-site agricultural buildings. Therefore, the approved appeal building is materially different from this appeal, which I have considered on its own merits and found to cause harm for the reasons set out.
9. For the reasons above, the appeal scheme harms the character and appearance of the area. It therefore conflicts with Policies GD3 and GD8 of the Harborough Local Plan. Together, alongside the aims of the Harborough SPD² these policies seek to protect the countryside from unacceptable development, which would harm its intrinsic value and rural character by requiring development to be of a high standard of design that respects and enhances the local character.
10. The proposal also conflicts with the National Planning Policy Framework, where it seeks to ensure that developments function well, are visually attractive as a result of good architecture and layout and are sympathetic to local character, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting.

Other Matters

11. As set out above, the previously approved scheme would result in less harm to the character and appearance of the area while still providing the necessary on-site facility. In relation to the current proposal, no substantive evidence has been submitted to demonstrate that it would deliver any additional rural economic benefits that might weigh in favour of the appeal. Accordingly, these considerations do not lead me to reach a different conclusion regarding the appeal scheme.

Conclusion

12. In light of the above, I conclude that the proposal would conflict with the development plan as a whole, and there are no material considerations that indicate that the development should be determined otherwise than in accordance with it. Therefore, the appeal is dismissed.

A Hickey

INSPECTOR

¹ Ref: APP/F2415/W/23/3324943

² District of Harborough Development Management Supplementary Planning Document