



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 July 2017

by L Fleming BSc (Hons) MRTPI

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

Decision date: 17 July 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/U2615/W/17/3168949

Land of Short Road, Cherry Lane, Browston Norfolk NR31 9DN

- 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 Miss Georgia Edwards against the decision of Great Yarmouth Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 06/16/0692/F, dated 31 October 2016, was refused by notice dated 19 December 2016.
 - The development proposed is new residential single storey detached dwelling and resiting stables.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is whether the proposal would amount to sustainable development having regard to the development plan and national policies.

Reasons

3. The appeal site comprises a stable building and paddocks within a group of dwellings and other buildings in a dispersed pattern of development mainly along the frontages of narrow rural lanes within a settlement known as Browston.
4. Browston does not have a defined settlement boundary. Saved Policy HOU10 of the Great Yarmouth Borough-wide Local Plan (2001) (LP) permits the erection of new dwellings outside of defined settlement boundaries if they are required in connection with either agriculture, forestry, organised recreation or the expansion of an existing institution. Furthermore, Policy CS02 of the Great Yarmouth Local Plan: Core Strategy (2015) (CS) states that growth within the Borough must be delivered in a sustainable manner by balancing the delivery of new homes with new jobs and service provision creating resilient self-contained communities and reducing the need to travel.
5. The proposal would provide a new dwelling and involve the replacement of a stable block for the exclusive use of the appellants. It would not therefore amount to organised recreation. Furthermore the proposal would not be connected with either agriculture, forestry or the expansion of an existing institution and is therefore in conflict with saved Policy HOU10 of the LP.

6. I acknowledge that the area has access to public transport, but no substantive details of those routes or their frequency have been put before me. Whilst there may be services and employment in nearby settlements the likely limited frequency of any public transport and the lack of employment and services such as schools, shops or healthcare in Browston means the occupants of the proposed dwelling would need to travel long distances to meet their day to day needs and would be dependent on the private car for the majority of their journeys which is the least sustainable mode of transport. This would be in conflict with the aims of Policy CS02 of the CS and the promoting sustainable transport aims of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework).
7. Paragraph 55 of the Framework encourages housing in rural areas where it will maintain or enhance the vitality of rural communities but requires isolated new homes in the countryside to be avoided unless there are special circumstances. There is no substantive evidence before me which demonstrates such special circumstances exist in this case.
8. The occupants of the proposed dwelling might work locally and use local services. There would be a social benefit associated with the provision of a new dwelling for a family and economic benefits associated with new customers, employees and the construction of the proposed development. I have also noted the existing stables are deteriorating and their replacement would be of visual benefit and would also benefit the welfare of horses. I also note the security benefits of the proposal.
9. However, even if I were to accept that the proposed dwelling would not be isolated, due to the modest scale of the proposal it would have a negligible impact on the vitality of the rural community. Thus, the vitality of the rural community would be at best maintained.
10. Therefore, when all of the modest benefits are combined they are outweighed by the significant environmental harm I have identified as a result of lengthy journeys to access services and employment and the dependence on the private car for those journeys. Consequently, the proposal would not amount to sustainable development and would be in conflict with the development plan and the Framework. It would specifically conflict with Policies CS1 and CS2 of the CS and saved Policy HOU10 of the LP which seek to ensure a sustainable pattern of development and reduce the need to travel.

Other Matters

11. In reaching these conclusions I have also noted the appellant's obligations under the Animal Welfare Act and the Code of Practice for the Welfare of Horses. However, these matters do not demonstrate the need for a new dwelling on the site.
12. I have also considered the examples of development nearby where new dwellings are under construction or have recently been granted planning permission including Lochnivar¹. However, the full details of those other cases are not before me, in any event the presence of development nearby is not sufficient to justify a proposal which I found to be harmful as each case is considered on its merits.

¹ Council Reference 06/15/0140/F

Conclusion

13. For the reasons set out above, on balance the proposal is in conflict with the development plan and does not amount to sustainable development as set out in the Framework. Thus having had regard to all other matters raised, I therefore conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

L Fleming

INSPECTOR