



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 15 November 2021

by Chris Baxter BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19 November 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/E2734/W/21/3272110

Wharfedale Grange, Red House To Castle View, Dunkeswick LS17 9FD

- 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 Mrs Claire Thomas against the decision of Harrogate Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 21/00212/FUL, dated 19 January 2021, was refused by notice dated 5 March 2021.
 - The development proposed is erection of a glasshouse in connection with a flower growing business.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for erection of a glasshouse in connection with a flower growing business at Wharfedale Grange, Red House To Castle View, Dunkeswick LS17 9FD in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 21/00212/FUL, dated 19 January 2021, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not 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 plans: Drawing Nos 001; 018; HB22958-001 Issue B

Preliminary Matters

2. Since the submission of the appellant's appeal the revised National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) was published and came into force on 20 July 2021. In light of this I have sought the views of the main parties in writing and comments received have been taken into consideration.
3. The appeal site lies within the West Yorkshire Green Belt. The Council have confirmed that the proposed use of the glass house would be for horticultural purposes and therefore would not be inappropriate development within the Green Belt, being in accordance with Policy GS4 of the Harrogate District Local Plan 2020 (HDLP) and the exceptions detailed in the Framework.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

5. The appeal site is within a rural countryside location that is characterised in the wider setting by open fields. Within the immediate setting of the appeal site

there are a scattering of buildings as well as a mix of landscaping including hedgerows and trees. It is this combination of built development mixed within natural landscaping that contributes positively to the character of the area.

6. In the context of the existing buildings in the area, the proposal would not appear overly large. The proposed free standing building would sit fairly central within the existing field however with the proposed use of sympathetic materials this would ensure that the building would not be a domineering structure.
7. The proposal would be well sited close to existing trees and hedgerows, and would not be overly dominant or an intrusive feature when viewed from the surrounding area, including the adjacent Harrogate Road and public right of way.
8. Due to its use of materials, design, scale and siting, the proposal would be a sympathetic structure that would not appear as an incongruous feature or detract from the rural character of the surrounding area.
9. Accordingly, the proposal would not have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the surrounding area. The proposal would be in accordance with Policies HP3 and NE4 of the HDLP which seeks development to incorporate high quality design that contributes to local distinctiveness and protects landscape character.
10. The Council have indicated that the scale of the building is inappropriate for an agricultural use based on the submitted evidence and that alternative sites were not explored. There is nothing apparent in Policies HP3 and NE4 of the HDLP which requires the scale of an agricultural or horticultural building to be justified by evidence or for a sequential approach on site selection to be undertaken for such a proposal. In any case, this matter does not alter my findings above with regards to the scale of the proposal and its effect on the character and appearance of the area.

Conditions

11. Conditions relating to timeliness and the identification of plans are necessary in the interests of proper planning and to provide certainty. A condition is not required in relation to materials as sufficient details were provided with the application submission.

Conclusion

12. The proposal would not conflict with the development plan and there are no other considerations, including the provisions of the Framework, which outweigh this finding.
13. Therefore, for the reasons given above, the appeal should be allowed.

Chris Baxter

INSPECTOR