
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 June 2017

by Debbie Moore BSc (HONS) MCD MRTPI PGDip

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 3 July 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/E2001/W/17/3169856

Land South West of Manor Farm, School Lane, Holmpton HU19 2QS

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Frank Hill and Son Ltd against the decision of East Riding of Yorkshire Council.
 - The application Ref DC/16/03924/PLF, dated 17 November 2016, was refused by notice dated 19 January 2017.
 - The development proposed is "erection of a dwelling (Plot 5)".
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are: (i) whether the site is suitable for residential development, having regard to its countryside location and; (ii) the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area, in particular, the Holmpton Conservation Area.

Reasons

Location

3. The appeal site is located on the corner of School Lane and Out Newton Road, within the village of Holmpton. It forms part of a larger site that has planning permission for four detached houses, accessed via a single drive leading from School Lane. The four houses that have been approved lie within the development limits of the village. However, the development limits exclude the appeal site, which is within the countryside for development plan purposes. Policy S4 of the Local Plan¹ seeks to promote appropriate development in villages and the countryside, and it sets out the forms of development that are supported in countryside locations. There is no evidence that any of these apply in this case.
4. The appellant contends that the development would relate well to the residential development already approved and would be logical extension to the village. However, the development limits of the recently adopted Local Plan exclude the site in order to limit opportunities for infill development, as the Council considers that the village is not a sustainable location for larger

¹ East Riding Local Plan 2012-2029 Strategy Document, adopted April 2016

residential development. Although the appellant considers the site to be sustainable, there are no details before me of any existing services and facilities in the village. I understand that there is a bus service which connects Holmpton with Withernsea and Easington, but this is relatively infrequent and the destinations are limited. There may be a bus service which connects the village with other destinations but I do not have details of this. It is likely, therefore, that future occupants would be dependent on the private car for access to everyday facilities. Although the appellant suggests that residents would support local services in nearby villages, there is no evidence behind this assertion as people are equally as likely to travel to towns.

5. Paragraph 55 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) states that local planning authorities should avoid new isolated homes in the countryside. I appreciate that the development would form part of the larger scheme of residential development and, in that sense, it would not be isolated. However, as explained above, the development would be isolated from a range of services and facilities. The reason why the development limits have been so defined is to direct development towards more sustainable locations, whilst also enabling a limited amount of development in villages to support their viability. The incremental addition of a further house in this location, which would be beyond the development limits, would undermine Council's development strategy as set out in the Local Plan. The fact that planning permission has been granted on the adjoining land does not outweigh the policy.
6. I have considered the appeal on a nearby site, as referenced by the appellant.² The full balance of considerations that informed that decision is not before me, but in any event, that appeal was determined prior to the adoption of the Local Plan, the policies of which now carry full weight. I note that the Inspector referred to services and facilities in the village, and a bus service. As explained above, the details of this are not before me and the situation may have changed since the appeal was determined.
7. Overall, I find that the site would not be suitable for residential development due to its location beyond the development limits of the village. Consequently, the development would not accord with Policy S4 of the Local Plan, and would not meet the aims of paragraph 55 of the Framework, which seek to direct development to the most sustainable locations. There are limited benefits to the development, including its contribution to the local housing supply, and I note the support from members of the Parish Council. However, these benefits would not outweigh the conflict with the development plan.

Character and Appearance

8. The application site is within the Conservation Area and is close to several listed buildings, including Manor Farm House. The settlement has an irregular layout with development largely fronting onto rural lanes. The significance of the Conservation Area is attributed to the informal layout, the predominance of trees and hedgerows and the vernacular style of architecture.
9. The village layout is not uniform and there is no strong building line. Some of the houses are set back in the plots and there are gaps between developments, which contribute to the rural setting. The proposal would form part of a cul-de-sac, which would be a more contemporary layout. However, the appeal site is

² APP/E2001/A/13/2194191 dated 2 September 2013

the least prominent part of the overall development and the house would not be highly visible in the wider area. The house would be seen in the context of the houses already approved and, in isolation, it would not have a materially greater impact on the character and appearance of the area than the scheme already approved.

10. The development would be screened from the nearby listed building and separated by its garden. Consequently, I find that the development would preserve the setting of the listed building.
11. To conclude on this issue, I find that development would preserve the character and appearance of the Conservation Area, in accordance with Policy ENV3 of the Local Plan. However, this does not overcome the concerns in relation to the site's location in the countryside as set out above.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above, the appeal is dismissed.

Debbie Moore

Inspector