



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 March 2026

by N Teasdale BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17th April 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/U2750/W/25/3377009

Land off Carrs Meadow, Escrick, North Yorkshire YO19 6JZ

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant full planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Escrick Park Estate against the decision of North Yorkshire Council.
 - The application Ref is ZG2025/0338/FUL.
 - The development proposed is erection of No. 8 dwellings and associated garages and landscape.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues of the appeal are:
 - The effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the surrounding area, including whether it would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Escrick Conservation Area (CA);
 - The effect of the proposed development on highway safety; and
 - The effect of the proposed development on flooding and drainage.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The appeal site comprises a parcel of land located within the development limits of Escrick. It is currently a grassed area used informally for recreation. Residential development is located to the north, east and south. To the west of the site lies the former abattoir buildings which has been granted planning permission for redevelopment for residential dwellings. The surrounding residential development is a mix of larger detached dwellings and terraced dwellings which are mainly red brick with red pantile roofs. The dwellings opposite the site to the east are set back from the street frontage behind boundaries comprising fencing, low hedges and brick walls.
4. The proposed development seeks planning permission for the erection of eight dwellings which would be largely accessed from Carrs Meadow to the east. Plot 8 would have vehicle access from Main Street which is located to the west. The proposed dwellings would comprise a mix of detached and semi-detached properties and would have a brick finish with red interlocking roof tiles. They would have a linear layout with amenity spaces to the front and rear.

5. As set out, the appeal site is located within the CA. I therefore have a duty under Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the CA. I have also had regard to paragraph 212 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) which explains that when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation.
6. The character and appearance of the CA is principally defined by its status as an estate village of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. The village is strongly framed by mature trees associated with the estate, and village buildings are set back behind relatively large front gardens and often in large individual plots. Although this character has been eroded in many places through infilling, garden development and a significant departure from Howard's vision in the late twentieth century, Escrick's core historic character has survived.
7. The properties along Carrs Meadow are set within spacious plots with dwellings set back from the main highway with amenity areas to the front. Plots 3, 4 and 5 would be positioned up towards the highway, which would result in narrow front gardens for each dwelling which would be at odds with the prevailing character and rhythm of space and landscape within the area. There may be some narrow plots in the wider village such as those on Main Street, but the appeal site would be read alongside those in the immediate vicinity along Carrs Meadow which are set back from the highway further than that proposed for the plots in question. I acknowledge Policy BEH2 of the Neighbourhood Plan which refers to the character of the village and the wider rural traditional agricultural vernacular of the Parish, but this would not alter my findings on how the site would be viewed and its impact on the street scene.
8. Plots 4 and 5 would also include a tall link element, which appears incongruous in design. It gives these plots a substantial mass and elongated frontage which would be clearly visible within the street scene despite being set back. Such a feature would be at odds with the vernacular style of nearby properties creating a disproportionate elevation. It is lower in height than the main dwellings, but this would not alter my findings as it would still be tall, and the overall design would be too large and out of keeping for these plots. I have considered the height of surrounding residential properties, but this would not alter how the link element is viewed and the design of this.
9. The projection to the rear of plots 6 and 7 would dominate the dwellings due to its ridge height being taller than the main part of the building. Whilst it may fall below some of the surrounding roof lines, it would still be visibly higher from the front of the property which is disproportionate. The plots sit within the deepest part of the site with a deep set back but again this would not alter my findings on how the rear projection would be viewed. Overall, it is considered that some of the design of the house types do not truly reflect the vernacular style of the area.
10. The Council raise concern regarding the density of the proposed development being much greater than other sites including those adjacent the site. I appreciate that the village green is integral to the character of Carrs Meadow and contributes to the perception of openness. However, the density of Carrs Meadow would indeed be greater without the inclusion of the village green. At my site visit, I observed the level of space surrounding the plots and do not find the proposed

density to be at significant odds with the prevailing character in the area. It would also not be considered over development on this plot of land. The plots would continue to be read in spacious surrounds, and this element is of lesser concern to me.

11. The Council raise concern regarding the building heights and roof pitches of plots 6 and 7 explaining that they are considerably taller and have a steeper roof pitch than the neighbouring dwellings. Building heights and roof pitches nearby do tend to be roughly in line with one another but I did find some slight variations due to level differences etc. The Proposed Street Elevation drawing show plots 6 and 7 to be slightly taller than the rest of the plots and they may be taller than perhaps some of the properties along Carrs Meadow. However, the height difference nor roof pitch is not so substantially different nor at significant odds with its neighbours. It would not stand out as an anomaly in this context where slight variations do already exist. This element is also therefore of lesser concern to me.
12. I note the appellant's claims regarding limited views within the CA, but the appeal site is still located within the CA which needs to be considered accordingly where a level of sensitivity is required. To this end, the proposed development would fail to reflect the local distinctiveness of the area and result in incongruous additions to the street scene.
13. For the above reasons, I conclude that the proposed development would unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the surrounding area. It would therefore fail to preserve the character and appearance of the CA causing less than substantial harm to its significance as a designated heritage asset. Taking into account the nature and scale of works, the extent of harm would be at moderate level on the spectrum.
14. Paragraph 215 of the Framework explains that where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use.
15. The benefits associated with the scheme include some economic, social and environmental benefit particularly to the local community from new dwellings. It would contribute 8 dwellings to the overall provision which would make a modest contribution to the overall housing supply. I am also aware of the energy efficiency and ecological arguments put forward although the extent to which such matters are beneficial is limited by the small-scale nature of the proposals.
16. Taking the stated benefits of the proposal together, there would be a moderate level of less than substantial harm to the significance of the CA, but this must be given great weight as advised by the Framework. I am not therefore persuaded that there would be public benefits of sufficient magnitude to outweigh the great weight to the assets' conservation and the considerable importance and weight to this harm.
17. The proposed development would therefore be contrary to Policies ENV1 and ENV25 of the Selby District Local Plan, 2005 (LP) and Policies SP4, SP18 and SP19 of the Core Strategy, 2013 (CS). Such policies together, amongst other matters, explain that development within or affecting a CA will be permitted provided the proposal would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the CA.

18. Additionally, the proposed development would also be contrary to Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings & Conservation Areas) Act 1990 and Chapters 12 and 16 of the Framework relating to achieving well-designed places and conserving and enhancing the historic environment.

Highway safety

19. As set out earlier, plots 1-7 would have vehicular access from Carrs Meadow and plot 8 would have vehicular access from Main Street. Each property would have off-street parking provision.
20. The proposed visitor parking spaces are located within an existing turning area on Carrs Meadow and whilst the spaces may be of suitable size, the angle at which these spaces are proposed makes them difficult to use safely and practically. I appreciate that the spaces would be clearly marked out and the edge of the carriageway would be defined whilst noting the location of the footway behind the spaces. Even so, I still find the angle to be difficult to navigate.
21. Parking for plot 7 would be located at a turning head and at my site visit, vehicles were indeed parked in this area. This has the potential to cause safety concerns due to blocking vehicle manoeuvring. The area may not be a formal parking space or specifically allowed but it is evident that parking does indeed take place in this area which I must consider. Off street parking is available for the dwellings to use and vehicles could park safely on street elsewhere. Again, this does not stop people from parking in this area which I must have regard to.
22. For plot 8, 3 parking spaces are provided, and the appellant explains that 2 spaces are located to the rear and one to the front adjacent to the plot 7 driveway. However, I am not convinced that the area for the latter parking space would be a safe and practical place to park a vehicle. It is located at a turning head and in a similar way to plot 7, it has the potential to cause safety concerns due to blocking vehicle manoeuvring.
23. The Council raise concern regarding the lack of visibility splays provided for each access. However, the Highways Technical Note provides information in this regard as well as visibility drawings. 2 metre x 2 metre vehicle to pedestrian visibility splays have been plotted at either side of each shared driveway access. These areas will be kept clear of obstruction above 0.6 metres in height. Vehicle to vehicle visibility splays have also been considered for each driveway. The speed limit on Carrs Meadow is 30 miles per hour although Carrs Meadow is a quiet residential cul-de-sac which also benefits from traffic calming measures in the form of speed humps. Given the nature of Carrs Meadow, it is realistic to assume that vehicle speeds are indeed lower at around 20 miles per hour or even lower.
24. I understand that Manual for Streets 2 states that a minimum X distance (the distance back from the road edge) of 2 metres may be considered in some low-speed situations when flows on the minor arm are low. It recommends a Y distance (the distance measured along the nearside kerb line) of 25 metres for vehicle speeds of 20 miles per hour which is considered an upper limit for speeds on the street given the nature of Carrs Meadow and traffic calming measures. A 2 metres x 25 metres visibility splay assuming 20 miles per hour vehicle speeds has been plotted, where it can be achieved whilst not encroaching any further beyond the land which is required for the 2 metre x 2 metre vehicle to pedestrian visibility splays. Where a 2 metres x 25 metres visibility splay is not achievable, the

achievable visibility splay without encroaching any further beyond the land which is required for the 2 metre x 2 metre vehicle to pedestrian visibility splays has been plotted. The minimum achievable Y distance using this method of constructing the visibility splays is 18 metres looking north out of plot 5 driveway, which equates to a vehicle speed of 16 miles per hour. This is considered to be appropriate, given that there is an existing speed hump located directly to the north of plot 5.

25. Some of the visibility splays for plots 6, 7 and 8 pass through the proposed visitor parking spaces and the adjoining proposed traffic islands which include tree planting. I understand that Manual for Streets 2 explains that parking in visibility splays in built up areas is commonplace and does not create significant problems in practice, and in some circumstances where speeds are low, encroachment into the visibility splays is acceptable.
26. The guidance also sets out that occasional obstacles to visibility that are not large enough to obscure a full vehicle or pedestrian, such as a tree, will not have a significant impact on road safety. Given the low speed and quiet nature of Carrs Meadow, it is considered that the proposed visitor parking and tree planting will not significantly impact on the available visibility for vehicles emerging from the driveways.
27. Visibility looking south-west out of the driveways for plots 7 and 8 has not been shown because the adopted road to the south-west is not a through route for vehicles and so vehicles are highly unlikely to be traveling along this route. As it is a through route for pedestrians, suitable vehicle to pedestrian visibility splays will be provided.
28. Overall, I find that suitable visibility splays are achievable for vehicles emerging from the driveways of all the plots, given the quiet nature of Carrs Meadow and the fact that vehicle speeds on Carrs Meadow will be low ranging and traffic flows are very light.
29. In addition to the above, the nature of Carrs Meadow and the footpath to the front means that drivers will emerge from their driveways cautiously and more slowly. A lack of harm in this respect would not however overcome the other harm I have identified when considering the matter of highway safety.
30. For the above reasons, the proposed development would be prejudicial to highway safety. It would be contrary to Policies ENV1(2), T1 and T2 of the LP which together, amongst other matters, requires development to take account of the relationship of the proposal to the highway network, the proposed means of access, the need for road/junction improvements in the vicinity of the site, and the arrangements to be made for car parking. For the same reasons, the proposed development would also be contrary to paragraph 116 of the Framework which relates to highway safety.

Flooding and drainage

31. The Environment Agency Flood Map for Planning shows the appeal site to be located within flood zones 2 and 3, which is at high probability of flooding. The appellant however contends that the map shows some inconsistencies and errors and has been in communications with the Environment Agency regarding this. The Environment Agency has confirmed that they are aware of inconsistencies with some of the flood risk data within the areas in Escrick being identified as being

affected, including the area of interest. A Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) has therefore been prepared using the 2007 Stillingfleet Beck Modelling as advised by the Environment Agency. This demonstrates that no part of the site lies within flood zone 3 and that a small portion within the north of the site is located within flood zone 2.

32. The Environment Agency consultation response confirms that the proposed development will meet the Framework's requirements in relation to flood risk if a condition is included on the decision relating to accordance with the FRA and mitigation measures regarding finished floor levels and ground levels.
33. Although the Council relies on the Environment Agency Flood Map for Planning as the authoritative dataset which shows the site within flood zones 2 and 3, the FRA demonstrates that no part of the site lies within flood zone 3 and that a small portion within the north of the site is located within flood zone 2. Paragraph 175 of the Framework explains that the sequential test should be used in areas known to be at risk now or in the future from any form of flooding, except in situations where a site-specific flood risk assessment demonstrates that no built development within the site boundary, including access or escape routes, land raising or other potentially vulnerable elements, would be located on an area that would be at risk of flooding from any source, now and in the future (having regard to potential changes in flood risk).
34. There is no compelling reason why I should step away from the appellant's FRA and thus I have therefore had due regard to the information contained within. That said, a small portion within the north of the site is located within flood zone 2 and thus the need for a sequential test would still apply. Details about the sequential test and if necessary, exceptions test are included in the PPG. It should show that there are no reasonably available, lower-risk sites that are suitable for the proposed development. The PPG has updated their guidance relating to flood risk and coastal change. To this end, paragraph: 027 of the PPG expands on paragraph 175 of the Framework. It explains that, in applying paragraph 175, a proportionate approach should be taken. Where a site-specific flood risk assessment demonstrates clearly that the proposed layout, design, and mitigation measures would ensure that occupiers and users would remain safe from current and future surface water flood risk for the lifetime of the development (therefore addressing the risks identified e.g. by Environment Agency flood risk mapping), without increasing flood risk elsewhere, then the sequential test need not be applied.
35. Based on the FRA submitted and taking into account the information received from the Environment Agency, I am sufficiently satisfied that the proposed layout, design, and mitigation measures would ensure that occupiers and users would remain safe from current and future surface water flood risk for the lifetime of the development. Consequently, the sequential test need not be applied in the particular circumstances of this case. My findings on this matter would not however alter the outcome of this appeal.
36. For the above reasons, I am satisfied that the proposed development would not be required to undertake a sequential test to assess whether the development could be located in a sequentially preferable location. It is therefore acceptable in terms of flooding and drainage and would accord with Policy ENV1 (3) of the LP and Policies SP15 and SP19 of the CS. Such policies, amongst other matters, ensures

that development in areas of flood risk is avoided wherever possible through the application of the sequential test and exception test; and ensures that where development must be located within areas of flood risk that it can be made safe without increasing flood risk elsewhere. For the same reasons, the proposed development would also accord with the advice contained within Chapter 14 of the Framework relating to meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change.

Other Matters

37. The Council raise concern regarding separation distances between the rear elevation of plot 3 and the rear elevation of the approved dwelling on the former abattoir site to the west. As this did not form part of the reasoning for refusal as set out on the decision notice and that I am dismissing the appeal on other grounds, I do not find it necessary to consider this matter further.
38. Those matters not in dispute would not weigh in favour of the appeal but rather be a neutral factor in my overall decision.
39. The Council accepts that at present they are only able to demonstrate a housing land supply of 2.4 years and therefore cannot demonstrate a five-year supply of deliverable housing sites. Consequently, because of the provisions of footnote 8, paragraph 11d) of the Framework should be applied. This requires the grant of permission unless: i. the application of policies in the Framework that protect areas or assets of particular importance provides a strong reason for refusing the development proposed; or ii. any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the Framework taken as a whole, having particular regard to key policies for directing development to sustainable locations, making effective use of land, securing well-designed places and providing affordable homes, individually or in combination.
40. Criteria i) includes footnote 7 which explains that the policies referred to are those in the Framework (rather than those in development plans) relating to amongst others, designated heritage assets.
41. On this basis and in light of my findings above in relation to heritage matters, I find that the application of policies in the Framework that protect areas or assets of particular importance provides a strong reason for refusing the development proposed. As a result, the presumption in favour of sustainable development does not apply.
42. Notwithstanding and as set out earlier, whilst I appreciate that there would be some economic, social and environmental benefits associated with the scheme particularly the provision of dwellings to the overall housing supply, the extent to which these are beneficial are limited by the small-scale nature of the proposals. The adverse impacts of this scheme as identified above would therefore significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against the policies in the Framework taken as a whole. This further emphasises that the presumption in favour of sustainable development does not apply.

Conclusion

43. The proposed development would conflict with the development plan when read as a whole. There are no other considerations, including the provisions of the

Framework that would individually or cumulatively outweigh this harm. The appeal is therefore dismissed.

N Teasdale

INSPECTOR