



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 July 2025

by **F Rafiq BSc (Hons) MCD MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 8 August 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/G4240/D/25/3362863

Carr House, 25 Carr Lane, Stalybridge SK15 3NS

- 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 Ian Cowley against the decision of Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council.
- The application Ref is 23/01118/FUL.
- The development proposed is the erection of a detached garage/workshop and associated driveway.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are:
 - whether the proposal is inappropriate development in the Green Belt, having regard to the development plan and the National Planning Policy Framework (Framework); and
 - if the proposal is inappropriate development, whether the harm by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations so as to amount to the very special circumstances necessary to justify the development.

Reasons

Whether inappropriate development

3. The appeal site is situated in the Green Belt. The Government attaches great importance to Green Belts. The fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence.
4. The Framework establishes that development in the Green Belt is inappropriate unless one of the exceptions set out at paragraph's 154 / 155 of the Framework apply. This includes the extension or alteration of a building, providing that it does not result in a disproportionate addition over and above the size of the original building which the appellant has referenced.
5. The proposed development would be for a detached building. It has been established that a detached structure can be considered an extension to a building, even if it is not physically attached. In this instance, despite being close to an outbuilding, the proposal would be some distance from the main dwelling. I do

not therefore consider it to be an extension or alteration of a building despite the functional link with the appeal dwelling, as it is intended to provide storage for cars as well as tools and other equipment.

6. Reference has also been made by the appellant to the development being considered under the exception at paragraph 154 g) of the Framework relating to the limited infilling or the partial or complete redevelopment of previously developed land. The proposal would be within the curtilage of the appeal dwelling, which is not in a built-up area, and as such, having regard to the definition of previously developed land in the Framework, I consider the site can be considered as previously developed land.
7. Paragraph 154 g) of the Framework also sets out that it is necessary for development to not cause substantial harm to the openness of the Green Belt. Whilst there may have been historical development on the appeal site as referenced by the appellant, the Framework requires an assessment against the existing position.
8. As the proposal would introduce a building where there is currently none, the proposal would have a greater spatial impact on the openness of the Green Belt. The development would adopt a partially subterranean design, allowing views over the proposed building from a nearby footpath. The proposal would also benefit from some screening from boundary treatment and surrounding trees and vegetation. Despite this, the proposed building would still be visible from various vantage points, including along the proposed driveway and as such, this would result in substantial harm to the visual aspect of openness.
9. In relation to the purposes of the Green Belt, as the proposal does not seek to extend beyond the curtilage, I do not consider that it would conflict with any of its purposes, including that purpose which seeks to safeguard the countryside from encroachment. The proposal would however overall result in substantial harm to the openness of the Green Belt, and it would not meet the requirements of paragraph 154 g) of the Framework.
10. I therefore conclude that the proposal would be inappropriate development. As such, it would be contrary to Policy JP-G9 of the Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan Document and Paragraph 153 of the Framework which state, amongst other matters, that inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances.

Other considerations

11. The appeal proposal would provide a secure parking facility within a building and storage space for other items that are said to be currently stored in Carr House. The proposal would also enable parking to take place off the single track and closer to the property. There are however other outbuildings/stores on the appeal site which could accommodate some of the storage requirements. In any event, I have not been provided with evidence that the appeal scheme is the only means to achieve these parking and storage facilities, and I therefore attribute limited weight to them.
12. My attention has been drawn to the historical position on the appeal site with regards to built development, but this does not provide sufficient justification to allow the proposal which would be contrary to Green Belt policy.

13. Reference has been made to a nearby similar development at 18 Carr Cottages¹ for a detached garage, but from the information provided, this referenced development differed from the appeal proposal in that it involved the demolition of an existing outbuilding. The proposed garage in that case would also be in closer proximity to the main dwelling, unlike this appeal proposal. I do not consider the circumstances of this nearby development are comparable to the appeal proposal, which I have determined on its own merits.

Other Matters

14. The proposal would not harm the living conditions of nearby residential occupiers and is in an accessible location to a range of services. The development would use sympathetic materials, and its sensitive design would preserve the character and appearance of the Carrbrook Conservation Area and also preserve the significance of nearby listed buildings. These are however neutral matters and not ones which weigh in favour of the proposal.

Conclusion

15. I have found that the appeal proposal would be inappropriate development, which the Framework clearly sets out is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances. The Framework says that substantial weight should be given to any harm to the Green Belt. Very special circumstances will not exist unless the harm to the Green Belt is clearly outweighed by other considerations.
16. I have attached limited weight in favour of the scheme to the provision of parking and storage requirements for the reasons given. The other considerations raised, are neutral matters.
17. With this in mind, the substantial weight I have given to the Green Belt harm is not clearly outweighed by these other considerations sufficient to demonstrate very special circumstances.
18. I therefore conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

F Rafiq

INSPECTOR

¹ LPA Ref: 20/00973/FUL