



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 January 2025

by **P Eggleton BSc(Hons) MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 30 January 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/U2750/D/24/3356511

Chartwell, Angram Road, Long Marston, North Yorkshire YO26 7LR

- 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 James Riley against the decision of North Yorkshire Council.
 - The application reference is ZC24/02300/FUL.
 - The developments proposed are first floor extensions to the rear of the property over the existing kitchen and patio.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are whether the proposal would amount to inappropriate development within the Green Belt; whether there would be any other harm to the Green Belt; and whether the harm by reason of inappropriateness and any other harm, would be clearly outweighed by other considerations, so as to amount to the very special circumstances necessary to justify the development.

Reasons

3. The proposal would include a side and a rear first floor extension to this dwelling within the Green Belt. The property was significantly altered following an application in 2019. The appellant has indicated that the now proposed works, together with existing extensions, would result in an increase in volume of 43% compared to the original property. This figure has not been disputed by the council. The first floor side extension would however partially enclose the area of patio below it and this would add to the overall perceived scale of the works. In any event, the size of the existing ground floor kitchen extension and the proposed first floor extensions, when having regard to the originally approved rear elements, would result in a substantial increase in the scale of the property.

Whether inappropriate development

4. Policy GS4 of the Harrogate District Local Plan 2014-2035 (2020) (LP) requires that Green Belt development complies with national policy. The National Planning Policy Framework 2024 advises that new development should be regarded as inappropriate unless it falls within one of the listed exceptions. The exceptions include 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.

5. The Framework does not specify a figure as to what represents a disproportionate addition. However, the works proposed, together with the balance of the increase in scale of the 2019 works, would represent a substantial increase in scale compared to the original dwelling. It would represent a disproportionate addition over and above the size of the original building. The proposal does not therefore fall within the exception with regard to extensions in the Green Belt and would represent inappropriate development in the Green Belt. It would also result in a reduction in the openness of the Green Belt.

Other considerations

6. The proposed works are to the rear of the property and as such would not be publicly visible. As they would be built on already developed land, they would not increase the spread of development. The position of the property within the settlement and the relationship of the works to the existing building, help to limit the harm to openness. The proposal would result in a larger and more adaptable family home that would provide social benefits. The works would also require significant investment which would have wider economic benefits.

Conclusions

7. The Framework establishes that inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and substantial weight should be given to that harm. It advises that approval for inappropriate development will not be given, except in very special circumstances. These will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations.
8. The works would represent inappropriate development and the greater scale of development would reduce openness. No other harm would result as the design would be acceptable and the impact on neighbouring residents would be minimal. I have had regard to the considerations above, but they would not clearly outweigh the harm from inappropriateness.
9. There are no considerations that represent the very special circumstances that would be necessary to justify the development. It would therefore be contrary to the policies of the Framework, relating to the Green Belt, that indicate that the development should not be approved. As such, it would also conflict with LP policy GS4. I therefore dismiss the appeal.

Peter Eggleton

INSPECTOR