

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 February 2017

**by Siobhan Watson BA(Hons) MCD MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government**

**Decision date: 2 March 2017**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/N2739/D/16/3164892**

**Whiterose Bungalow, Great North Road, South Milford, Leeds, LS25 5LQ**

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
  - The appeal is made by John Taylor against the decision of Selby District Council.
  - The application Ref 2016/0952/HPA, dated 10 August 2016, was refused by notice dated 4 October 2016.
  - The development proposed is a detached garage.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a detached garage at Whiterose Bungalow, Great North Road, South Milford, Leeds, LS25 5LQ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 2016/0952/HPA, dated 10 August 2016, subject to the following conditions:
  - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin no later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
  - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plan: "Proposed Garage at Whiterose Bungalow."
  - 3) The external materials of the garage hereby approved shall match those of the main house.

### Main Issue

2. The appeal site is in the Green Belt so the main issue is:
  - Whether the proposal would be inappropriate development for the purposes of the National Planning Policy Framework.

### Reasons

*Whether or not it would be inappropriate*

3. Paragraph 89 of the Framework states that the construction of new buildings should be regarded as inappropriate in the Green Belt unless they fall within various exceptions. One of these is "the extension or alteration of a building provided that it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building." No evidence has been submitted to suggest that the garage would result in a disproportionate addition.
  4. From what I saw at my visit, the proposed garage would be positioned a very short distance from the dwelling. Furthermore, the garage would be on the
-

drive which is a logical and functional place in relation to the main building. There is an existing garden wall between the house and the site of the proposed garage but the wall is low and would not interfere with the visual or functional connection between the dwelling and the garage. Due to this close relationship, I consider that the garage can be regarded as an extension and therefore, the proposed development falls within one of the exceptions as set out in Paragraph 89 of the Framework.

5. I conclude that the proposed garage would not constitute inappropriate development for the purposes of the National Planning Policy Framework. Consequently, I find no conflict with Selby District Core Strategy Policies CS Policies CS2 and CS3 which seek to protect the Green Belt from inappropriate development.
6. For the above reasons, I allow the appeal.

*Siobhan Watson*

INSPECTOR