
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 July 2017

by David Cross BA (Hons), PGDip, MRTPI

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

Decision date: 14 August 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/E2001/W/17/3173790

Crows Nest Farm, Station Road, Howden DN14 7LF

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant outline planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr J Kenny against the decision of East Riding of Yorkshire Council.
 - The application Ref DC/16/02370/OUT/WESTWW PP-05213438, dated 3 August 2016, was refused by notice dated 17 October 2016.
 - The development proposed is erection of a detached dwelling and creation of vehicular access.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The application has been submitted in outline with approval sought in relation to layout, with all other matters reserved for future consideration. I have dealt with the appeal on that basis.
3. The description of the development above has been taken from the planning application form. In Part E of the appeal form it is stated that the description of development has not changed from that stated on the planning application form but, nevertheless, a different wording has been entered. Neither of the parties has provided written confirmation that a revised description of the development has been agreed. Accordingly, I have used the one given on the original application.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is whether, having regard to the location of the appeal site in relation to services and facilities and in conjunction with local and national planning policy, the proposed development would amount to a sustainable form of development.

Reasons

5. The approach of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) to the promotion of sustainable development in rural areas, set out in paragraph 55, is that housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities. The Framework goes on to note that local planning authorities should avoid new isolated homes in the countryside unless

there are special circumstances, such as the essential need for a rural worker to live permanently at or near their place of work in the countryside; where such development would represent the optimal viable use of a heritage asset or would be appropriate enabling development to secure the future of heritage assets; where the development would re-use redundant or disused buildings and lead to an enhancement to the immediate setting; or the proposed dwelling is of exceptional quality or innovative.

6. The appeal site is located outside of the settlement boundary for the town of Howden as defined in the East Riding Local Plan 2016 (ERLP). Although the site is located within the hamlet of North Howden which includes a public house and railway station, I note that this hamlet does not have a defined settlement limit within the ERLP and that the Council states that the site is within the open countryside. From my observations of the site and the surrounding area, this linear development extending along the road appears typical of the small groups of dwellings and other buildings that can be found within the surrounding open countryside and does not represent a distinct settlement.
7. Facilities in Howden would be approximately 2km away and would be accessed via a cycle path adjacent to the B1228, although this route is unlit for a significant extent of the route. Whilst the route is relatively flat and on a designated cycle path, I consider walking and cycling would not be a realistic or convenient option for future occupiers of the dwelling due to the length of the route and limited lighting, particularly in the evenings and during the winter months. I note that the built edge of Howden is approximately 1.8km from the appeal site, and that a site allocated in the ERLP will reduce this. However, this does not affect the accessibility of services within the settlement. Therefore, the appeal proposal would to all intents and purposes result in an isolated home in the countryside in that it would be remote from the nearest designated settlement of Howden.
8. The site is located in close proximity to Howden Railway Station which I saw provided a regular train service to major centres in the region such as Hull, York and Leeds as well as the wider national rail network. However, whilst I acknowledge that this would increase the accessibility of the site in relation to main centres of employment, I do not consider that this will provide a significant alternative to a reliance on the private car to meet the everyday needs of residents due to the relative convenience of these modes of transport.
9. I am mindful of the benefits that would arise from the proposal. The dwelling would make a modest contribution to the mix and supply of housing in the area. Residents of the dwelling would add to the community and contribute to the support of services in the area, although this would be to a limited degree. The construction of the dwelling would generate employment and investment, though this would also be of a limited degree and for a limited period of time.
10. I note that there is a disagreement between the parties as to whether the site is within the curtilage of Crows Nest Farm. I also note that the appellant contends that the site is previously developed land as it had contained a chapel, although I saw that the site was overgrown with limited evidence of previous structures on the site and appeared to be in an advanced state of blending into the landscape. However, even if I were to concur with the appellant on these matters, I do not consider that they outweigh my concerns

identified above in relation to proximity to services and conflict with planning policy.

11. I conclude that the proposed development would not be located where future occupiers would be able to rely on accessible local services and facilities to serve their everyday needs without having to travel some distance and in all likelihood by car. It does not meet any of the criteria specified in Paragraph 55 of the Framework and would conflict with national planning policy in relation to the sustainable location of rural housing. The proposal would also conflict with Policy S3 of the ERLP which seeks to focus development in sustainable locations, and would not comply with the forms of development in the countryside which may be supported under Policy S4. The benefits arising from the proposal do not justify making a decision otherwise than in accordance with the development plan and national planning policy. The proposal would not therefore represent an acceptable and sustainable form of development.
12. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

David Cross

INSPECTOR