



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 February 2026

by **M Willis BSc MA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26th February 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/U2750/W/25/3375677

Sedgefield House, Ainderby Steeple, Northallerton, North Yorkshire DL7 9JY

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a failure to give notice within the prescribed period of a decision on an application for planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr S Tweddle against North Yorkshire Council.
 - The application Ref is ZB25/00874/FUL.
 - The development proposed is an application for planning permission to build a steel framed agricultural building.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a steel framed agricultural building at Sedgefield House, Northallerton DL7 9JY in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref ZB25/00874/FUL, subject to the following conditions:
 1. The development shall be begun not later than the expiration of three years from the date of this decision.
 2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following drawing nos:

Site Plan Proposed dated 7 May 2025
Location Plan dated 28 March 2025
3863-02 – Proposed East and West Elevation dated 7 May 2025
3863-03 – Proposed North and South Elevation dated 7 May 2025
3863-04 – Plan Views dated 7 May 2025
3. That part of the building to be used to house livestock shall be restricted to cattle or sheep only and no other form of livestock.

Applications for costs

2. An application for costs was made by Mr S Tweedle against North Yorkshire Council. This application is the subject of a separate Decision.

Preliminary Matters

3. The Council revised the description of the development from that cited on the original application form. I have used this revised description as it more accurately describes the proposal.
4. The appeal is made on the grounds that the Council failed to determine the application in the prescribed statutory period. The Council has stated that had it

made a decision on the application it would have refused planning permission. The putative reasons for refusal given are due to insufficient information having been provided relating to the building's use and the lack of a floor plan showing the internal layout of the building. I have had regard to both parties' submissions in establishing the main issue to be considered in this case.

5. The appeal documentation contains information on the proposed use of the building and potential floorspace split for those uses. The Council has had regard to this information in its response to this appeal, however, it considers this information to represent an evolution of the scheme from that proposed at application stage and so should be discounted. I also note that representations were made by third parties regarding the purpose and need for the building at application stage. Consequently, I have considered whether accepting the additional information provided at appeal stage regarding the use of the building would result in any procedural unfairness.
6. As indicated above, the Council revised the description of the development from that originally proposed by the appellant to that which I have used in the banner heading. The specific use(s) were not included within the revised description and had the Council considered this necessary then it could have sought to clarify this when agreeing a revised description. Similarly, if a floor plan was considered necessary to validate the application then this should have been sought at that time and before the application was processed. Notwithstanding this, I note the building was clearly identified on the application form as being for agricultural use. Therefore, whilst the appeal documentation provides more clarity over its intended use, this does not result in a fundamentally or substantially different proposal to that which was proposed at the time the application was originally made. Consequently, accepting this information at appeal stage would not result in procedural unfairness and so my decision is based on the evidence submitted as part of this appeal.

Main Issue

7. Having regard to the above and the evidence before me, the main issue is whether there is an agricultural need for the building.

Reasons

8. Sedgefield House is a farm as well as wedding venue and glamping site that is located in the open countryside outside the village of Ainderby Steeple. The appeal site is positioned close to an existing complex of buildings which includes converted barns used as a wedding venue and residential accommodation associated with farm and the wedding/holiday business. The land surrounding the site is characterised by rolling farmland comprising a mixture of arable and pasture uses. There is evidence of the land immediately surrounding the site being used to house livestock.
9. The proposed building would be comprised of concrete panel walls with timber boarding above and a shallow pitched roofed formed of grey fibre cement profile sheeting. The building would be used to store feed stuffs, livestock and machinery with the floorspace of the building being split between these different uses. The plans supporting the application show the building as being attached to a similar agricultural building which has previously been approved but which, at the time of my visit, had not been completed (Permission ref: 21/02352/FUL).

10. As I witnessed during my visit, there is evidence of a functioning agricultural use taking place on the land immediately adjoining the site. There also appears to be a current lack of internal storage space or facilities available for the housing of machinery and livestock. Whilst I appreciate planning permission has been granted for another similar agricultural building on the site, this has yet to be constructed and so is not currently available. I also note that an application for another building is said to be under consideration by the Council, however, I do not know the details of that proposal or the reasons as why that building is being sought as it is not before me. In any case, each case must be considered on its own merits and so that is what I have done in this case.
11. Interested parties have questioned the need for the proposed building and the Council has indicated that would have been beneficial if more information had been provided at application stage regarding how building fits into the wider operational needs of the farmholding. As part of this appeal the appellant has provided a list of the equipment which he proposes to store within the building along with an indication as to how the internal floorspace would be divided between the proposed storage and livestock uses. The Council has confirmed that both the equipment list and the proposed allocation of floorspace are reasonable and proportionate given the scale of the building and there is nothing before me which would lead me to reach a different conclusion. Consequently, based on the evidence before me and from my observations on site, the building's size and intended uses are reasonably necessary for the purposes of agriculture and required to support the ongoing framing operations taking place at the site. However, given the building's proximity to the residential and holiday accommodation nearby, I agree with the Council that it would be appropriate to restrict its use so that it cannot house pigs or poultry given these animals are more likely to generate odours that could adversely affect occupants, unlike sheep and cattle.
12. For the reasons given above, I find that there is an agricultural need for the building and that the proposal would accord with Policies S1, S5, EG7, E1, E2, E3 and E7 of the Hambleton Local Plan 2022 (HLP). Together these policies, amongst other criteria, lend support to proposals for new and expanding businesses, including rural enterprises and which are reasonably necessary for the purposes of agriculture and require development to be appropriate in terms of its siting, scale, design and materials so as not to harm the character, appearance and distinctive characteristics of the landscape and amenity of the users of neighbouring land and buildings.

Other Matters

13. The Council raised no objection to the siting and design of the building, however, concerns were raised by interested parties regarding the effects of the building on the rural character of the area. The proposed building is of a modest size and would be constructed of materials that are typical of agricultural buildings and which are a characteristic feature of the local landscape and the open countryside more broadly. Based on the submitted plans, the appeal building would be physically connected to the previously approved building and so would likely be constructed at the same time. Although the building would be visible from the public right of way that runs close to the site, its position within the site is such that it would be visually well related to the existing and previously approved buildings. Given this, and given the building is of an appropriate design, size, scale and

appearance, it would not harm the overall character and appearance of the local landscape or open countryside.

14. Concerns were raised that the appellant intends to move the site away from farming and into hospitality; that the building could be converted into further accommodation to serve the wedding business and that the inclusion of the first floor fire escape supports this potential future use. Concerns were also raised regarding potential increases in traffic should this occur and animal welfare concerns.
15. I appreciate the first floor fire escape is an unusual feature for an agricultural building however, this does not in itself suggest an alternative use to that for which permission has been sought. Additionally, whilst the alleged intentions of the appellant are noted this has not been substantiated and in any case this appeal should be determined on its own merits and on the basis of the information and evidence before me, not something which is claimed to be proposed and which cannot be substantiated. In this case the description of the development makes it clear the building is for agricultural use. If, for any reason, the appellant sought to change the use of the building then this would require separate approval and provide an opportunity for the planning merits or otherwise of that proposal to be assessed by the Council. Concerns relating to animal welfare concerns are noted however these are not a planning matter. Consequently, whilst the comments and concerns of interested parties are noted they do not alter my findings in this case.

Conditions

16. A set of suggested planning conditions, agreed by both parties, has been provided should the appeal be allowed. I have considered the suggested conditions against paragraph 57 of the Framework and advice contained in the Planning Practice Guidance and have carried out minor edits to ensure the conditions meet the relevant tests.
17. In addition to the standard time limit condition [1], I have included an approved plans condition [2] in the interests of precision and clarity. I have also attached a condition [3] restricting the type of livestock to be housed in the building to cattle and sheep only. This condition is necessary as other forms of livestock are more likely to generate odours that could adversely affect occupants of the holiday accommodation.
18. I have omitted the suggested condition which required the building to be constructed using the materials as shown on the approved plans. This condition is not necessary as the materials are identified on the application form and the approved plans already referenced in condition [2].

Conclusion

19. For the reasons given above the appeal should be allowed.

M Willis

INSPECTOR