



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 December 2025

by **A.Graham BA(hons) MAued IHBC**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16 December 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/U2750/D/25/3375328

Manor House Cottage, Hag Lane, South Kilvington, North Yorkshire YO7 2NY

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant outline planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Gary Downes against the decision of North Yorkshire Council.
 - The application Ref is ZB25/00835/FUL.
 - The application is for existing double storey property extended by proposed new double storey living quarters leading to single storey amenity wing which unites the building with the existing stables. Proposed extension to match existing buildings rendered external finish whilst also incorporating more contemporary, durable finishes. The extension has a combination of pitched and flat roofs with roof lights.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal upon the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a sizeable detached house with stabling, barn and outbuildings that make up an equestrian holding. The building stands prominently upon a bend in Hag Lane before the lay of the land lowers to the east and south. From farther afield the site can clearly be seen standing high within the landscape. The house is off white rendered with a red pantile roof. The footprint of the main house is 'L' Shaped and there is a single storey lean to range and a conservatory to the rear with a long linear range of stables and other outbuildings extending into the plot.
4. The nearest property to the appeal site is Manor House which is a much more typical vernacular building of red brick, pantile and of a double fronted form. This building has other outbuildings that are also occupied as residences, at least one of which faces in the general direction of the appeal site. I have little evidence before me to ascertain whether any historic relationship existed between the appeal property and Manor House, but I consider the name 'Manor House Cottage' could be suggestive of some historical hierarchy whereby the property to the north is the principal building in the hamlet. It appears from the planning history that extensive extensions were granted in the 1970's and 90's that have likely seen the appeal property enlarge considerably from its role as a cottage prior to this.

5. The proposals before me seek permission to further extend this house but taking the design trajectory not from the local vernacular character, but instead attempting a form of contextual modern design. In this respect the lower cross wing gable range would be extended along with an enlarged ground and first floor extension in place of the existing conservatory behind. This would create space for a master bedroom, dressing and en-suite along with another bedroom at first floor and would create a larger kitchen and dining area to the ground floor. The existing single storey linear range would be linked to the main house with an extension along the north of the plot.
6. In terms of architectural design, a pitched roof extension would extend along the south of the building range but the rest of the first floor would be under a flat roof, thereby creating a sizeable two storey flat roof extension. Pantiles, render and zinc cladding would be the chosen materials.
7. In assessing this appeal, I am aware of the Council's Local Plan Policy E1 which reflects the National Planning Policy Framework (The Framework) in its desire that new development be of a high quality that integrates with its surroundings and reinforces local character and sense of place. I am also aware of the need to respect the living conditions of neighbours through Policy E2.
8. This proposal envisages a considerable enlargement to an already sizeable property. As such further alterations would result in a maximising of the scale of this building both within its landscape context and when viewed alongside its neighbours. Despite the same render and materials being used, the proposal would introduce a scale of development that would be largely out of context to this location where most sizeable farms or buildings appear to consist of lower, more ancillary ranges of similar architectural design.
9. In this case, although traditional design motifs have been used in the form of a modern pitched roof extension, which may have some merit in isolation, the rest of the proposal would introduce a largely alien form of development in the style of a large flat roof double storey extension. Although the Appellant's concerns about a valley gutter are noted, and although the Council's Domestic Extensions Guide¹ (SPD) provides some leniency for flat roof extensions, in this case the appropriateness of such a design is highly questionable.
10. As evidenced through the original Design and Access Statement, it is clear to me the proposal has not taken a thorough enough approach to understanding the context of this site, nor its historic relationship to the Manor House next door. As such the proposal fails in meeting Policy E1 with regards proposals being based upon the local distinctive character of an area. I would expect such an analysis would typically be used to inspire such a modern design interpretation, especially within such a rich landscape as this, but this understanding of context appears largely absent here.
11. Ultimately, the proposal would result in an overly large flat roof edifice that would be visible from farther afield along Hag Lane where the appeal site is seen on top of a hillside. It would therefore not only introduce a large form and massing that would somewhat dominate the original house, but it would also appear almost brutalist in

¹ Hambleton Local Development Framework Domestic Extensions Supplementary Planning Document adopted 22 December 2009.

its appearance without a robust design rationale or reasoning. Therefore, the character and appearance of the area would be harmed through this proposal.

12. Furthermore, although some distance is maintained between properties to the rear of Manor House they currently have an outlook onto a fairly standard dwelling house gable interspersed with landscape. However, the proposed extent of the extension, together with its flat roof and minimal fenestration, would present a very over bearing form of development directly within the eyeline, and towards the southern aspect, of residents to the rear.
13. As such the proposal represents a poor design response that not only fails to take into account the impact that its presence would have upon neighbours, but also fails to represent a grounded design solution that is based upon a thorough enough understanding of the site in question.
14. As such, although there are ways to further extend this property, perhaps in a modern manner if so desired, the proposal before me would be harmful and would subsequently be in conflict with Policies E1 and E2 of the Hambleton Local Plan 2022 as well as the overriding policy criteria as contained within The Framework itself.

Conclusion

15. The proposal would cause harm to the character and appearance of the area and the living conditions of neighbours and would be in conflict with the Local Plan. As such the appeal is dismissed.

A Graham

INSPECTOR