



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 September 2024

by Chris Baxter BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 24th October 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/U2750/W/24/3348711

Former Manor Farm, Balk YO7 2AJ

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant outline planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by K Baker Design & Development Ltd against the decision of North Yorkshire Council.
 - The application Ref is ZB23/02048/OUT.
 - The development proposed is demolition part existing barns and outline application for 1 no. dwelling with garage and existing barn annex for associated residential use with access.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. Outline planning permission is sought with all matters reserved except for access. I have determined the appeal on this basis.
3. Following the submission of a Preliminary Ecological Assessment, the Council has stated that the proposal would not harm a biodiversity interest and the concerns behind the second reason for refusal has been addressed. I have therefore determined the appeal on this basis.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is whether the proposed development is suitably located with regards to affordable housing and, social and economic support.

Reasons

5. Policy S3(d) of the Hambleton Local Plan (HLP) states the development strategy for Hambleton is to focus growth at identified rural communities, where limited development will be supported to help address affordable housing requirements and where development can support social and economic sustainability.
6. There is a lack of compelling evidence before me which indicates that the proposal would provide an affordable home, nor is there any substantial justification indicating a reduced need for affordable housing in the immediate area. The proposed development is made in outline, with revised plans reflecting this, and there are no specific details in terms of scale, layout, landscape and appearance for the proposed development. Nevertheless, there are insufficient details which indicate that the proposed development would

help to address affordable housing requirements and therefore the proposal does not meet this requirement in Policy S3(d) of the HLP.

7. The proposal would bring some social and economic benefits. In terms of social matters, the scheme would introduce additional residents into the local community. The appellant argues that the proposal would have a positive effect in terms of improving character and appearance and bringing a redundant site back into use. The development would benefit the local economy by providing employment during the construction as well as future occupiers using local facilities.
8. The social and economic benefits would be minimal given the development is for a single residential unit. There are very few public services and facilities within the village of Balk. There are also limited footpaths which link to other areas with more facilities as well as no indication of regular public transport options near the site. Due to its location and the limited facilities in Balk, future occupiers of the proposal would be reliant on the use of motor vehicles and more inclined to reach essential services beyond that of the village of Balk. Given the proposal is for a single property and its proposed location, I am not satisfied that the proposal would support social and economic sustainability within the rural community of the village of Balk and therefore would not meet the requirement in Policy S3(d) of the HLP.
9. The proposal would not be suitably located as the development would not be supported to help address affordable housing requirements and would not support social and economic sustainability. The proposal would therefore be contrary to Policy S3(d) of the HLP.
10. I have had regard to the submitted statement of cases which raises matters including in relation to housing mix, the Nationally Described Space Standards, the Council's Housing and Economic Development Needs Assessment and Strategic Housing Market Assessment, planning conditions, Council housing targets and the Council's Housing Supplementary Planning Document. These matters however do not alter my findings with regards to the specific issues detailed in Policy S3(d).

Other Matters

11. In addition to the benefits described above, the proposal would not be harmful in relation to flooding or drainage, ecology and biodiversity, highway safety, character and appearance of the surrounding area, contamination, living conditions of neighbouring residents, and the site is not in a Site of Special Scientific Interest or subject to any site-specific environmental or landscape designation. A letter of support for the scheme has been submitted with no objections from consultees. It is also noted that the Council concede that, other than Policy S3(d), the proposal does accord with other policies of the HLP, such as Policy HG5.
12. Due to the development being for a single residential unit, I attribute minimal weight to the benefits and matters described above. These would not outweigh the harm that the scheme brings in not according with Policy S3(d) of the HLP which would disrupt the development strategy to focus growth in the Hambleton area.

Conclusion

13. The proposed development would conflict with the development plan as a whole and there are no other considerations, including the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework, which outweighs this finding.
14. Therefore, for the reasons given above, I conclude that the planning appeal should be dismissed.

Chris Baxter

INSPECTOR