



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 July 2025

by **Les Greenwood MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11 July 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/U2750/W/25/3362389

Belmont, 23 Skipwith Road, Escrick, Selby, North Yorkshire YO19 6JA

- 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 Dr Mark Fairbairn against North Yorkshire Council.
 - The application Ref is ZG2024/0946/HPA.
 - The development proposed is the installation of an air source heat pump (ASHP), 10kW, exceeding 0.6m³.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the installation of an air source heat pump (ASHP), 10kW, exceeding 0.6m³ at Belmont, 23 Skipwith Road, Escrick, Selby, North Yorkshire YO19 6JA in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref ZG2024/0946/HPA and the plans submitted with it.

Main Issue

2. The appeal was lodged against the failure of the Council to decide the application within the statutory period. The Council has since then confirmed that it has no objection to the proposal. There are no other local objections. I saw at my site visit that the proposed heat pump has been installed. This minor domestic structure is not visible from the street. The only concern would be its impact on the next door property, No 25, due to noise. I therefore consider the main issue to be the effect of the proposal on living conditions at 25 Skipwith Road.

Reasons

3. The heat pump is situated to the side/rear of No 23, opposite a side wall of No 25 with a glazed door and also near to No 25's rear windows and garden. There is therefore some potential for noise disturbance. Submitted reports, however, advise that the noise from the pump would meet the requirements of the Microgeneration Installation Standard MCS020. On this basis, and following a visit to the site, the Council's Environmental Heath raises no objection to the proposal. I see no reason to dissent from this view, noting that any future noise nuisance could be dealt with under other legislation.
4. The Council has not cited any conflict with development plan policies. I conclude that the appeal should succeed. As the proposal has been carried out acceptably, I see no need for any planning conditions.

Les Greenwood

INSPECTOR