



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 September 2025 by A Morrison MTCP MRTPI

Decision by F Harrison BA(Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17th December 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/E2001/D/25/3370355

County Farm, Long Lane, Woodmansey, East Riding of Yorkshire HU17 0RN

- 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 P Hagyard against the decision of East Riding of Yorkshire Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/00626/PLF.
 - The development proposed is a two-storey extension to side and rear following demolition of single storey element, detached garage with turning and parking, and existing parking area off private road changed to garden space with infill perimeter fence.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. County Farm is situated away from the nearest settlements, within an open countryside setting characterised by flat, irregularly shaped fields interspersed with low-lying residential and agricultural development. The appeal dwelling, which is set back from a roadside hedge and faces side on to Long Lane, is presently a modestly-sized two-storey building of simple form, possessing a single storey projection to its rear, limited road-facing glazing and uniform materials throughout. A range of former agricultural buildings, now in use as a wedding/function venue are sited adjacent to the dwelling. Although these structures occupy a considerable footprint, on account of their restrained height and positioning further back from Long Lane, they have a subservient spatial relationship to the host dwelling.
5. During my site visit I observed that the nearest neighbouring buildings to the appeal site are bungalows obliquely set back on the other side of the highway. Notwithstanding the limited screening effects of a run of mature trees to its east, this separation gives the existing dwelling, along with its associated commercial buildings, a relatively stand-alone presence within the rural street scene. However, due to the combination of its restrained proportions and simple design, the existing

dwelling has an understated overall appearance which is broadly sympathetic to the landscape character of the area.

6. It is not disputed that the infill fence element of the proposal is acceptable, and I agree. The proposed double storey extension would however wrap around most of the host dwelling's rear and road-facing side elevations, in doing so more than doubling its existing footprint and massing. Although it would have gabled forms, be partially set in from existing exterior walls and would incorporate slightly lower ridge heights, these features would not prevent the scheme from harmfully subsuming the host dwelling by virtue of its substantial scale and highly conspicuous positioning. Contrary to the East Riding Design Code (2025), it would be a visually dominant addition that would pay little regard to the current dwelling's modest presence, an effect compounded by the significant increases in length and drastic changes in appearance to those elevations in prominent views on approach from the west.
7. The scheme's excessive bulk would be emphasised through unsympathetic elements of its design. The proposed gable to its western elevation would have a contrastingly shallow roof pitch that would jar with the original roof form, whilst the heavily glazed twin gabled arrangement fronting the highway would introduce an urban appearance at odds with the character of the site and its countryside setting. Although I note the appellant's comments regarding internal controls, I have no substantive evidence whether such measures would provide sufficient mitigation, and accordingly these large windows would have the potential to give rise to light spill that would be detrimental to the area's rural qualities. The extension's incongruity would be furthermore pronounced through the contemporary range of proposed materials, which through their assorted coverage, would draw the eye and exacerbate the dwelling's greatly increased mass and muddled aesthetic.
8. Turning to the proposed triple garage, this would be positioned along and immediately behind the roadside hedge, thereby facing away from the highway onto a newly formed parking and turning area. Notwithstanding the partial screening and softening effects of the hedge, owing to its considerable overall dimensions and siting in proximity to the road, this building would be a pronounced addition to the rural street scene, plainly apparent when travelling towards the site along Long Lane, most particularly from the west.
9. Through its bulk and by occupying a position so close to the road, the garage would not reflect the prevailing layout of development in the area, wherein sporadic existing buildings are sensitively spaced well back from the highway and so do not affect the open countryside character in the same way the appeal scheme would. This element of the appeal scheme would therefore also be harmfully incompatible with its surroundings. Whereas the appellant refers me to an outbuilding located on Hull Road, the proposed garage is not closely comparable to this example due to differences in their spatial context, as well as in relation to their respective siting and form.
10. Overall, the proposals would result in significant harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area. The scheme would therefore conflict with Policies ENV1 and S4 of the East Riding Local Plan Update 2025 – 2039 (2025) which require development to be of a high-quality design that respects the character and appearance of its countryside surroundings, including by being of an appropriate scale and massing to its location.

Other Matters

11. I acknowledge that the proposed extension would provide increased space for the appellant's growing family and has been designed to satisfy modern living standards. This largely private benefit attracts very limited weight in support of the scheme. Although there would be no significant consequences for the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers and existing trees and hedges, these are neutral matters as required by policy and so weigh neither for nor against the proposal. Overall, the above matters are insufficient to outweigh the harm that I have identified to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area.

Conclusion and Recommendation

12. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

A Morrison

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

13. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

F Harrison

INSPECTOR