
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 June 2019

by J Hunter BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 29th July 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/E2001/W/19/3226802

Treyarnon, Main Road, Newsholme, Goole, East Riding of Yorkshire DN14 7JT

- 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 Mr Gary Mattinson against the decision of East Riding of Yorkshire Council.
 - The application Ref DC/18/02816/PLF/WESTWW, dated 22 August 2018, was refused by notice dated 6 December 2018.
 - The development proposed is detached dwelling and garage within curtilage of 'Treyarnon'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is whether the proposed development would be in a suitable location having regard to the accessibility of local facilities and services.

Procedural Matter

3. The National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) was revised in February 2019. I have taken the Framework into account as part of the determination of this appeal.

Reasons

4. The hamlet of Newsholme is an established residential area, but it is not listed within the defined settlements under Policy S3 of the adopted East Riding Local Plan Strategy Document 2016 (ERLP SD) and is therefore within the open countryside for planning policy purposes.
5. Policy S4 part C of the ERLP sets out forms of development that may be supported in a countryside location. I find no evidence that leads me to the conclusion that the proposal would fulfil any of the criterion listed within the adopted policy therefore, in this regard, I find conflict with Policy S4 of the ERLP.
6. There are no public services or facilities available in the hamlet of Newsholme however, there is a good selection in the nearby settlements of Wressle, approximately 2 km to the north west and Howden approximately 3 km to the south east and there is ready access to the A63. However, the A63 is a busy

classified road without footways or streetlighting and therefore I am unconvinced that sustainable modes of transport such as cycling, and walking would be realistically attractive as a genuine alternative to the private car.

7. During my site visit, I did note a bus stop approximately 200 m from the appeal site. However, I have been provided with no evidence in relation to the frequency and availability of bus services. Consequently, and for the reasons outlined above, I am not persuaded that there are any realistic alternatives to the use of the private motor car, such that it seems very likely that residents of the development would be largely reliant on the car. In this regard, I find conflict with the aims of adopted Policies ENV 1, S1, S2 and S3 of the ERLP.
8. Paragraph 78 of the Framework and Policy S4 of the ERLP promote sustainable development in rural areas where it would enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities. I accept that there would be benefits associated with the development of a single dwelling, including the housing delivery, construction of the development, increased local spending by occupants and support for local services. However, these would be very modest, commensurate with the modest scale of the development proposed. Such benefits would not overcome the harm that I have found in relation to the poor accessibility and consequential reliance upon the private motor car, and the associated conflict with the development plan.

Other Matters

9. The appellant refers to the proposal being 'infill' or 'rounding off' development. I accept that the development would physically infill a vacant plot of land within the existing built form. However, this is not a criterion within the relevant development plan policy relating to development within the countryside such that it does not weigh significantly in favour of the proposed development.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons outlined above, I conclude the appeal should be dismissed.

J. Hunter

INSPECTOR