



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 24 August 2021

by Paul Martinson BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 29 October 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/E2001/W/21/3275730

Land north west of Poplar House, Station Road, Camerton HU12 9JN

- 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 Mrs C Habblett against the decision of East Riding of Yorkshire Council.
 - The application Ref 21/00199/OUT, dated 19 January 2021, was refused by notice dated 7 April 2021.
 - The development proposed is described as 'proposed retirement bungalow following the demolition of existing domestic garage'
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The planning application was submitted in outline form with all matters other than access and landscaping reserved for future consideration. I have determined the appeal on this basis, treating the submitted plans and details provided as illustrative, other than in terms of access and landscaping.
3. I have taken into account the revised National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), as published on 20 July 2021 on which the main parties have had the opportunity to comment. Any reference to the Framework below is consequently a reference to this latest version.

Main Issues

4. The main issues are:
 - the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the surrounding area; and
 - whether or not the development proposed represents a suitable location for new housing having regard to the settlement strategy, and access to public transport, local services and facilities.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

5. The appeal site is a triangular portion of land located immediately adjacent to the rear gardens of a terrace of six dwellings that front Station Road. The site is located outside of any development limits boundary and therefore is termed Countryside for the purposes of Policy S4 of the East Riding Local Plan (2016)

- (ERLP). The adjacent properties form part of a cluster of dwellings that are separated from nearby settlements by open fields and together form a distinctive linear arrangement along Station Road. The surrounding area is characterised by open farmland.
6. Boundaries with the fields to the north and west of the site and with the rear gardens of Station Road tend to be formed by hedges of varying heights and consistency. The appeal site is accessed from Station Road via a long straight access track between the appeal property and its detached neighbour to the west. The site includes an existing garage which is easily visible from the access with Station Road. The garage is one of a number of outbuildings located to the rear of residential properties in the vicinity.
 7. It is proposed to demolish the existing garage and construct a new dwelling in its place with the remainder of the appeal site becoming the garden. Given the site's position being angled to the rear of the surrounding properties, a dwelling located on the appeal site would appear distinctly at odds with the existing linear character along this part of Station Road. It would be set back a considerable distance from the road frontage and would appear as an outlier and incongruous addition to this group of dwellings resulting in harm to the character and appearance of the area.
 8. Views from the south along Station Road are likely to be limited by neighbouring development. However, it is likely that the proposal would be at least partially visible above the boundary hedging on the approach towards the site from the north along Station Road and from the former railway line. Furthermore, a dwelling on the site would also be visible in the vicinity of the site access (notwithstanding that appearance, layout and scale are reserved).
 9. Whilst the appellant is proposing to maintain existing hedgerows and to infill an area where the existing hedge is absent, views would still be possible close to the site access. Furthermore, I note that hedges change over time and cannot be relied upon to provide the same degree of screening in the future as they do now.
 10. I have had regard to the presence of the existing garage and the developed nature of the site; however, this is clearly recognisable as a domestic outbuilding and, as noted above, it is located amongst other domestic outbuildings which are distinct from the linear arrangement of dwellings along this part of Station Road.
 11. For the above reasons, the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area and would conflict with Policies S1, S4, ENV1 and ENV2 of the ERLP and the provisions of the Framework which seek high quality design that preserves character and appearance.

Accessibility

12. In terms of Part A of Policy S4, I note that the development is of a relatively small scale, being a single dwelling and could be considered to be appropriate in principle in terms of scale and its location within a small cluster of dwellings. There is no evidence before me that the proposal would result in the loss of the best or most versatile agricultural land. The appellant considers that the appeal site is previously developed land, however even if I were to consider it as such,

Part C of Policy S4 limits new development in Countryside areas to a number of exceptions, none of which apply to the appeal proposal.

13. Nevertheless, there is a footway with regular streetlights from the appeal site to Burstwick which is around one kilometre away and has a number of services. Furthermore, the appellant has identified a bus stop close to the appeal site which is the route of a fairly regular service to Hull running between 0645 and 0002. Whilst being mindful that the Framework guides that opportunities to maximise sustainable transport solutions will vary between urban and rural areas, there are evidently other options rather than private vehicular reliance to access day-to-day service facilities, and the route from the appeal site would be similar to many nearby properties. The implications of one new home here, next to a number of others in terms of private vehicular usage would therefore not be unacceptable nor, in itself, undermine the aims of Policy S4 in that respect.
14. Nevertheless, I have found harm to the character and appearance of the area would result. For that reason the proposal would conflict with Part C of Policy S4 of the ERLP and therefore would not represent a suitable location for development having regard to the settlement strategy.

Other Matters

15. I note that the proposal is for a retirement bungalow to allow the appellant to continue to reside in an area in which they have lived for some time. Whilst I have had regard to this matter in my decision, these are essentially personal benefits as opposed to public harm I have identified above.
16. I have been referred to the previous approval of a new dwelling at Spaldington. However, I do not have full details of the circumstances that led to this proposal being accepted and so cannot be sure that it represents a direct parallel to the appeal proposal, including in respect of its relationship with the development limits, extant permissions and development plan policy. Nonetheless I note that the Spaldington scheme fronted a road unlike the appeal proposal. In any case, I have determined the appeal on its own merits.

Conclusion

17. For the reasons given above, having considered the development plan as a whole, the provisions of the Framework and all other relevant material considerations, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Paul Martinson

INSPECTOR