
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 September 2025

by **D M Love BA(Hons) PGCert MRTPI PISEP**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17 October 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/U2750/W/25/3366980

Land to the south of Carlton Road, THIRSK, YO7 4NJ

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant outline planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr K D Wood, Ey Up Holdings Ltd C/o KDW Architecture Ltd against the decision of North Yorkshire Council.
 - The application Ref is ZB24/01820/OUT.
 - The development proposed is described as “Application for Outline Planning Permission with some matters reserved (except for access) for 1 No dwelling”.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The description of the proposed development differs on the appeal form to the application form. I have taken the description from the appeal form as I feel this is more precise as it refers to those matters to be reserved.
3. The appellant has submitted an amended location and site plan from that before the Council. This reduces the extent of the site boundary within the original boundary. The ownership boundary retains the original site area. I have accepted this into the appeal on the basis that it does not alter the proposal or require further consultation.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is whether the proposed housing development would result in the loss of an important parcel of countryside and thereby harm the character and appearance of Carlton Miniott.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

5. Carlton Minniot spreads out in a predominantly linear form along the A61 west of Thirsk. The character is informed by a linear fashion of built development with gaps along the roadside adding to the rural nature of the village and preventing a coalescence of the built form. These undeveloped areas break up the built development maintaining the agricultural and rural feel of the village. This rural feel is established by fields running alongside the A61, properties being set in spacious plots and the presence of buildings of an agricultural appearance.

6. Carlton Miniott is identified as a service village under Policy S3 (Spatial Distribution) of the Hambleton Local Plan (HLP). This policy identifies that service villages can be developed in such a way that maintains the sustainability of rural communities but does not detract from their character and form. Given the site is undeveloped and outside the main built form of the village this appeal needs to be considered whether it falls within Policy S5 (Development in the Countryside).
7. Policy S5 of the HLP defines countryside as land outside of the existing built form of a settlement identified in Policy S3. In this instance the site is in a part of the village that is less dense and more widely informed by gaps in development providing for a more rural character. It is currently used for grazing and forms a gap between the plant hire/ agricultural buildings and residential development. I consider the appeal site to qualify as countryside under criterion 'c' of this policy insofar that it is a paddock that relates more to the countryside than to the main part of the village.
8. The policy further adds that development will only be supported in the countryside where it would not harm the character and appearance of the area in which it is located.
9. Having established the site lies within the countryside, Policy HG5 (Windfall Housing Developments) provides exceptions where it can support proposals adjacent to the built form of a village.
10. I consider that development of this site would conflict with criterion 'e' of Policy HG5 in that the proposal would have a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the village as a result of the loss of this piece of countryside which makes a significant contribution to the character of the area. Development of this site would erode the rural nature and character of this part of the village. The site provides an open space that adds to the rural character and provides a buffer to the extant farm buildings/ plant hire business adjacent. The potential benefits of a single property would not outweigh the harm to the character and appearance of the village.
11. Policies S3, S5 and HG5 of the HLP collectively set out the requirements of the spatial strategy for housing in and around service villages. In this instance I find that the parcel of land subject to this proposal contributes to the rural character of the village and should be maintained. The proposal would not be consistent with the requirements of these policies specifically in that it would be within the countryside and does not meet the exceptions listed in Policy HG5.

Other Matters

12. The appellant has provided the details of other appeal decisions in the area for residential development. I have had account of these in my consideration but ultimately provided them with little weight and determined the appeal on its own merits and based on the information before the planning authority at the time they made their decision.

Conclusion

13. The proposal would conflict with the development plan as a whole and there are no other material considerations, including the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework, which outweigh this finding. Therefore, for the reasons given above the appeal should be dismissed.

D M Love

INSPECTOR