
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 December 2020

by J P Longmuir BA (Hons) DipUD MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12 January 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/P0119/W/20/3259863

22 Engine Common Lane, Yate, South Gloucestershire BS37 7PX

- 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 and Mrs Morgan against the decision of South Gloucestershire Council.
 - The application Ref P20/07625/F, dated 30 April 2020, was refused by notice dated 30 June 2020.
 - The development proposed is the erection of new dwelling in lieu of recently approved garage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. Whether the proposed dwelling would be accessible to services/facilities

Reasons

3. The appeal site is part of a large garden to no.22 and includes the position of a new garage block, which was permitted in 2019. This has not been commenced and the dwelling would be built in its place.
4. The site is to the north of Yate linked by single width lanes and there are intervening large fields. There are some sporadic houses to the north of the appeal site, but they are not extensive enough to amount to a village.
5. The dwelling would be considerably distanced from the nearest facilities. On my site visit it took me twenty minutes to walk to the end of Engine Common Lane where the existing built-up edge of Yate became evident. This would be a prohibitively long time for regular use. Moreover, the lane is narrow, with several tight corners and being unlit, it would not be conducive to walking to facilities. Engine Common Lane is a designated Active Travel Route which is aimed at promoting cycling and walking, but that does not mean it would encourage the occupants to walk to facilities and services particularly in poor weather or the dark.
6. There is a bus stop 480m away, however the services would be likely to be sparse given the rurality, and I have not been given evidence to the contrary. The North Yate New Neighbourhood is being developed to the east. This follows a railway line which would act as a barrier to any connectivity and there are no

apparent connections towards this site. Additionally, this would be a purposely planned extension of Yate, and its siting to the east would be closer to facilities and public transport. As such it does not set a precedent for a dwelling on this site.

7. I therefore conclude that the occupants of the new dwelling would be car dependent for the needs of everyday life.
8. I have considered the list of other houses allowed in the area but have not been provided with comprehensive details to consider their comparability with the proposal. However, I note that there was a housing land shortfall at that time which may well have been a factor. In any event they do not provide an overriding justification at this current time for a newly built dwelling on this site which is remote from facilities.
9. The proposed dwelling would add to the housing stock and would provide social and economic benefits. However, these benefits would not outweigh the reliance upon private transport, particularly as the Council has a 5-year housing land supply.
10. Policy CS5 of the South Gloucestershire Local Plan: Core Strategy and Policy allows for development in Yate, whilst policy CS34 seeks to protect rural areas and respect settlement boundaries. PSP40 of the South Gloucestershire Local Plan: Policies, Sites and Places Plan limits residential development in the countryside to that needed for rural workers or conversion of buildings. The proposal would be contrary to these policies. I have also had regard to the National Planning Policy Framework, particularly paragraphs 8, 68, 78, and 79, but they reinforce the Development Plan policy concerns of a new house in this location.

Conclusion

11. I therefore conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

John Longmuir

INSPECTOR