



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 September 2025

by Mrs Chris Pipe BA(Hons), DipTP, MTP, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11 September 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/U2750/D/25/3370162

Chantry House, Hull Road, Cliffe YO8 6PH

- 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 Craig Oates against the decision of North Yorkshire Council.
 - The application Ref is ZG2025/0349/HPA.
 - The development proposed is described as erection of a single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for the erection of a single storey rear extension at Chantry House, Hull Road, Cliffe YO8 6PH in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref ZG2025/0349/HPA and the plans submitted with it, subject to the conditions set out below:
 - 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 materials identified on the application form and approved plans: Location Plan, Site Plan and Existing and Proposed Plan.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match that of the existing built form.

Procedural Matter

2. The Council changed the description of development from that referenced in the application form. In the interests of clarity, I have adopted the revised description of development.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area and the host property itself.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is a detached property which has been substantially extended. The site is detached from the built-up settlement of Cliffe, located in the countryside, a residential property, Chantry Hill Bungalow, is situated adjacent the site. The appeal site has a diverse appearance with the main property linked to a substantial annex comprising single and two-storey accommodation. The mix of single and two-storey elements is a feature of the appeal property.

5. Policy H14 of the Selby District Local Plan (2005) (the Local Plan) seeks to ensure developments are not visually intrusive in the landscape, would not result in a disproportionate addition over and above the size of the original dwelling, would not over dominate and to ensure the design and materials would be in keeping with the character and appearance of the dwelling.
6. The Council have provided calculations in their Delegated Planning Report confirming that the original dwelling had a volume of approximately 784.56 cubic metres. Due to previous extensions a further 599.28 cubic metres was added to the volume of the property, creating a property which is approximately a 76.4% increase in volume over and above that of the original dwelling. These figures are not disputed by the appellant.
7. Whilst modest in scale the proposed development would add volume to the already substantially extended appeal property. The cumulation of previous extensions and works to the property are extensive which has resulted in a form of development which is significantly larger than the original property as demonstrated by the Council's calculations.
8. The Council cite in their Delegated Planning Report that in recent appeal decisions it is considered that extensions in the countryside with a cumulative volume of over 50% are normally considered disproportionate. I have not been provided with any substantive evidence to support this, however the previous extensions totalling 76.4% increase in volume would be considered disproportionate based on the Council's reasoning. The proposed development whilst adding volume would not exacerbate the built form given its modest scale and discrete location.
9. The rear of the appeal site is screened from public views by mature landscaping, the neighbouring property and the appeal property itself. I observed during my site visit that the neighbouring property would have views of the proposed development. Nevertheless the proposed development would be a modest single storey rear extension which would not be visually out of keeping nor dominate the existing property. Due to the scale and location, the proposed development would not be visually intrusive in the landscape.
10. Despite increasing the scale of the property, I find that the proposed development would be sympathetic to the design and form of the existing property.
11. The proposed extension would increase the footprint of the annexe to create an additional bedroom, I have no substantive evidence to suggest that the annexe would function differently as a result of the proposed development.
12. I conclude that the development would not harm the character and appearance of the area and the host property itself. There is no conflict with SP19 of the Selby District Core Strategy Local Plan (2013) and Policies H14 and ENV1 of the Local Plan which seek amongst other things to ensure developments are of high quality design having regard to the local character, identity and context of its surroundings.

Conclusion and conditions

13. For the above reasons I conclude that this appeal should be allowed.
14. I have imposed a standard condition relating to the commencement of development and a condition specifying the relevant plans as this provides certainty. In order to

safeguard the character and appearance of the area I have imposed a condition concerning materials.

Chris Pipe

INSPECTOR