

---

14/05 (02)

CASE NUMBER: 05/06048/FULMAJ  
GRID REF: EAST 422220 NORTH 456170

---

**APPLICATION NO.:** 6.99.35.J.FULMAJ

**LOCATION:**

Millstones Restaurant Skipton Road Felliscliffe Harrogate North Yorkshire HG3 2LT

**PROPOSAL:**

Erection of an 18 bedroom annex with caretakers flat, associated landscaping and woodland planting, provision of additional parking spaces and new lighting scheme to the buildings and surrounding areas. (Site area 1.049ha)

**APPLICANT:** Millstones Restaurant

REFUSED. Reason(s) for refusal:-

- 1 The proposal does not provide the sequential test required by PPS6 in relation to such uses, and no exceptional circumstances have been advanced to justify the building of a new hotel in the open countryside and the proposal therefore conflicts with the provisions of Criterion B of Policy C1 and the requirement of Policy TR2 of the adopted Harrogate District Local Plan.
- 2 The proposal introduces a new dwelling unit into the countryside and there are no special circumstances to warrant such a development which is therefore contrary to the provisions of Criterion B of Policy C1 and Policy H7 of the adopted Harrogate District Local Plan.
- 3 The proposal will introduce an imposing and prominent building into an open and undeveloped area of countryside with the Nidderdale Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty that will be harmful to the landscape character of the locality. The proposal is therefore contrary to the provision of Criterion A of Policy C1; Criterion D of Policy A1 and Criterion A of Policy TR2 of the adopted Harrogate District Local Plan.

(Mr Goodwin attended the meeting and spoke to the item as the applicant's agent under the Council's Opportunity to Speak Scheme).

(Mr Ashby attended the meeting to answer questions only as the applicant, under the Council's Opportunity to Speak Scheme).

(Councillor Mrs Atkinson declared a personal interest in this item on the basis that the architect was known to her, but on the basis that the interest was not prejudicial, she remained in the meeting and took part in the debate and voted thereon).

(Councillor Grange declared a personal interest in this item on the basis that the architect was known to him and also because he had attended various social events at the premises, but on the basis that the interest was not prejudicial, he remained in the meeting and took part in the debate and voted thereon).

(Councillor Wilson declared a personal interest in this item on the basis that the applicant's agent was personally known to him, but on the basis that the interest was not prejudicial, he remained in the meeting and took part in the debate and voted thereon).

(Eight Members voted for the motion and seven voted against).