



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 March 2026

by Alison Scott (BA Hons) Dip TP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27th March 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/U2750/W/25/3376386

Keepers Cottage, Chester Court Road, Camblesforth YO8 8JD

- 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 M Townend against the decision of North Yorkshire Council.
 - The application Ref is ZG2025/0619/FUL.
 - The development proposed is Demolish existing dwelling and outbuildings and replace with proposed.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the local area and whether or not there would be an impact on protected species, more specifically bats.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The appeal site is located outside the development limits of Camblesforth within the open countryside. It is accessed along a country lane and set within a green environment of what appears to be pastoral land with sporadic dwellings positioned along the lane.
4. The appeal site is a vacant two storey dwelling set close to the edge with the lane adjacent to another residential cottage. Its plot contains private gardens and an outbuilding that would be demolished alongside the main dwelling and consolidated into one single family unit as a replacement dwelling.
5. Policy ENV1 of the Selby District Local Plan (SDLP) amongst other things, seeks to secure local distinctiveness. Policy H13 of the SDLP supports the replacement of dwellings in the countryside provided they meet specific criterion. In this instance, the parties agree that the principle of a replacement dwelling is acceptable in this location although they disagree that the proposed replacement dwelling as, according to the Council, it would not be similar to the size and scale of the original dwelling.
6. At approximately 34% increase in volume, the appellant considers this to be a reasonable volume increase although the Council originally found the increased size to be considerably greater when compared to the combined original dwelling and outhouse. From my assessment on the ground, these buildings are very

modest in their existing proportions, and the outhouse is also very low level. The original dwelling will have most likely resembled a three up two down style house with a ground floor bathroom added at a later date. The overall footprint of both buildings is small.

7. As a combination including integral garage and four bedrooms at first floor together with ensuite and separate family bathroom, the proportions of the proposed dwelling would significantly increase from one that is a modest sized dwelling, to one of a substantially larger family home. There would be considerably more bulk overall as it would encompass two storeys, with a higher ridgeline than the original roof and a completely different design of a more substantial hipped roof configuration.
8. Despite the consolidation of the two buildings into one and even if I were to find the increased volume to be around 34%, given the proposal before me, the overall proportions, scale and size of the replacement dwelling would not be considered reasonably similar to what it would replace.
9. Even with the use of appropriate materials, the dwelling takes on a more urban characteristic with the component integral garage and hipped roof instead of a more traditional pitched roof as is currently insitu. It may be set back further into the site. This would have limited impact to reduce its visible bulk as it would not resemble a simple and traditional rural dwelling and instead would be more obtrusive within the landscape. The intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside as noted in the National Planning Policy Framework, would not be safeguarded.
10. Therefore, to conclude on this main issue, the proposal would not respect local character and distinctiveness and therefore contrary to the design aims of Policy ENV1 of the SDLP and Policy H13 that aims for new residential development to safeguard the landscape.

Impact on protected species

11. The site is a vacant building set in natural landscaping within the open countryside. The Council's ecologist originally raised the need for a bat survey to determine the impact of the proposal on this ecological priority species. Since this time the appellant has provided a Preliminary Ecological Appraisal. The ecologist advised that a planning condition could overcome the risk to bats at the site.
12. Should I be minded to allow the appeal, an appropriate condition can mitigate the effects on these protected species as it would meet the tests of paragraph 57 of the Framework.
13. Therefore, to conclude on this main issue the proposal would meet the requirements of Policy ENV1 of the SDLP and Policy SP18 of the SD Core Strategy and the Framework in their combined objectives to protect the natural environment.

Other Matters

14. The appellant refers to another Inspector's decision¹ within North Yorkshire and their view on disproportionate extensions. The Inspector was referring to extensions to existing dwellings and not completely new build developments.

¹ Appeal reference APP/U2750/D/25/3370162

Therefore, as this proposal is for an enlarged replacement dwelling and not an extension to an existing dwelling, I apportion limited weight to this comparison.

Balance and conclusion

15. I have found in favour of the proposal with regards to the potential to mitigate against any adverse impact on roosting bats should I find in favour of it. However, the effect on the character and appearance of the local area leads me to conclude that this effect would have a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the local area. I have considered all matters that have been raised and conclude that the proposal would conflict with the development plan as a whole and there are no other material considerations which lead me to determine the appeal otherwise than in accordance with it. Therefore, for the reasons given, the appeal is dismissed.

Alison Scottt

INSPECTOR