
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 December 2025

by **Paul Martinson BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 08 December 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/C2741/D/25/3370861

**The Granary, Old Carlton Farm, Sandy Lane to Boundary, Stockton on the Forest
York YO19 5XS**

- 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 Philip Hodgson against the decision of City of York Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/00046/FUL.
 - The development is Single storey side extension and first floor side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The application seeks planning permission for partially retrospective extensions and alterations to the dwelling. A previous retrospective application for a similar, albeit larger scheme¹ was also refused and dismissed at appeal². Whilst I have carried out a site visit and had regard to what currently exists, my decision is nonetheless based on the proposed plans.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are:
 - whether the development would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt having regard to the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) and any relevant development plan policies;
 - the effect of the development on the openness of 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 required to justify the proposal.

Reasons

Whether Inappropriate Development

4. The Framework identifies that the fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open. It goes on to state that inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances. The Framework further

¹ Ref: 23/01149/FUL.

² Appeal Ref: APP/C2741/D/24/3337153.

establishes that the construction of new development in the Green Belt should be regarded as inappropriate, subject to a number of exceptions as set out in paragraph 154. Policy GB1 of the City of York Local Plan (2025) (the LP) is broadly consistent with the Framework in this regard.

5. The appellant has also directed me to the Green Belt exception 154. g). limited infilling or the partial or complete redevelopment of previously developed land (PDL), whether redundant or in continuing use which would not cause substantial harm to the openness of the Green Belt. The appellant argues that the appeal site is PDL) and the proposal is for its partial or complete redevelopment. Having regard to the Framework definition of PDL, and the lack of compelling evidence to the contrary I am satisfied that the appeal site constitutes PDL for the purposes of this appeal.
6. The appellant does not set out why the proposal would constitute the partial or complete redevelopment of PDL, however the redevelopment of land almost always involves the construction of new buildings, typically after demolition of previous ones. Whilst the proposal would involve some alteration to existing extensions and construction of new extensions, the original building would be altered but remain intact. What is proposed is therefore essentially the extension and alteration of the original building, rather than amounting to either the partial or complete redevelopment of the land. On this basis I therefore conclude that the proposed development would not fall within the exception set out in Framework paragraph 154 g).
7. Nevertheless, the extension and alteration of an existing building is an exception, at 154. c), provided that it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building. Policy GB1 of the LP includes the same exception.
8. Neither the Framework nor Policy GB1 define a disproportionate addition, however the latter refers to the House Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document (2012) (SPD). This refers to an increase in excess of 25% as a guide as to what may be considered disproportionate in situations such as this. Whilst I recognise that this is guidance, this is nonetheless a useful parameter to have regard to when assessing whether an extension to a house in the Green Belt countryside is disproportionate or not.
9. The original building in this case is that which was converted to residential use from a former agricultural building, following a grant of planning permission in 1993³. This was a simple two storey linear building with a rectangular footprint. A subsequent grant of planning permission for a single storey extension in 1997⁴ followed and the provision of a first floor extension above and a conservatory were in place by 2021.
10. The original building had a floor area of around 72 square metres. The extensions described above, taking into account the development forming the appeal scheme would amount to a building with a floor area of 177 square metres. This would represent an increase of 145% over and above the original building. I am mindful that the appellant has sought to reduce the extent of additions, including through demolition of previously existing elements, and reducing the volume of the proposed. I am nonetheless required to consider the additions cumulatively. The

³ Ref: 145C/PA.

⁴ Ref: 97/501/FUL.

amount of extension to this previously simple linear building would therefore be disproportionate and well in excess of the 25% set out in the SPD.

11. Consequently, the proposal would be inappropriate development that is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt.

Openness

12. Openness is an essential characteristic of the Green Belt that has spatial as well as visual aspects. The appeal property is located within a small enclave of similar converted buildings that are served by an access road from Common Lane. The small grouping is surrounded by open farmland comprising a predominantly flat landscape. Like its neighbours, the garden of the appeal property is sizeable and includes a number of trees with a mixed fence and hedge boundary.
13. The appeal building can be clearly seen from the access road serving the former farm buildings which is also a public right of way. The building group is visible across open countryside from the edges of Stockton-on-the-Forest. The additions to the building would inevitably result in a loss of spatial openness, whilst the visual loss of openness would be more modest but still nevertheless, discernible, particularly in views from the access road. Given that the majority of the visibility arises through the access into the site, I am not convinced that the harm to visual openness could be significantly diminished through landscaping. Furthermore, any landscaping would take time to establish during which time the harm to openness would ensue.
14. The appeal scheme would result in a harmful loss of openness, which weighs against the proposal. The proposal would conflict with Policy GB1 of the LP on this basis.

Other Considerations

15. The appellant argues that *'there is a lot of large scale development that can be carried out under permitted development, resulting in a significant increase in volume, with outbuildings occupying up to 50% of the curtilage, all of which far exceeds the amount of development undertaken at the Site to date'*. The appellant lists a number of potential developments that could be carried out and argues that significant weight should be applied to this "fallback position".
16. However, permitted development rights are subject to various limitations and conditions and there is insufficient evidence before me to reach a judgement as to whether the operations listed would meet those. There is also no certificate of lawful development, for example, attesting clearly to what could be undertaken in any event, or the extent to which permitted development rights remain intact, having regard to the amount of development that has already been carried out to the original building. Furthermore, I note that some permitted development rights referred to prevent the carrying out of other elements and therefore this is not a clear position. Overall, therefore I give the appellant's fallback position limited weight.
17. I am not convinced that the inclusion of a condition removing permitted development rights amounts to a significant benefit of the scheme as there must be a reasonable expectation that further permitted developments would be undertaken. I see no reason to conclude differently to the previous Inspector in this

regard. Given the already significant scale and extent of the building and outbuildings, it is unlikely that the appellant would compound the visual harm to the property by constructing more ad hoc permitted developments at the appeal site. Like the previous Inspector, I attach limited weight to this argument.

18. The appellant sets out that the dwelling is more sustainable and efficient than it was. The detail in this regard is very limited, and I cannot be certain that this would be the case. This carries limited weight. Similarly, I cannot attribute significant weight to landscaping for which there is no detail. Furthermore, as is clear from my above reasoning, the provision of landscaping would be unlikely to have a meaningful impact on openness.
19. That the dwelling would now be suitable for family living is not a public benefit and would constitute more of a private benefit to the appellant.

Conclusion

20. The Framework sets out that when considering any planning application, local planning authorities should ensure that substantial weight is given to any harm to the Green Belt, including harm to its openness. Whilst the appellant argues that substantial weight should not be given to development on PDL, footnote 55 is clear that is only in circumstances where the proposal has been found to be not inappropriate. This, therefore, does not apply here.
21. The proposed development would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would harm openness. The Framework establishes 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 and any other harm are clearly outweighed by other considerations.
22. Given the substantial weight I am required to give to Green Belt harm, relative to the limited benefits of the proposed scheme, the harm that would arise would not be clearly outweighed by other considerations. Therefore, the very special circumstances necessary to justify the proposal do not exist, such that the appeal should be dismissed.
23. I have considered all other matters raised but none outweigh the conclusions I have reached. For the reasons set out above, I dismiss the appeal.

Paul Martinson

INSPECTOR