



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 April 2019

by A Graham BA(hons) MAued IHBC

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19th September 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/F4410/W/18/3217303

Home Farm and Lodge, Home Farm, High Street, Austerfield, Doncaster.

- 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 Mark Anderson against the decision of Doncaster Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 18/02228/FUL, dated 3 September 2018, was refused by notice dated 1 November 2018.
 - The development proposed is for the construction of a single new house.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is whether or not the site represents a suitable location for a dwelling having regard to policies for the location of new housing and the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is a former farm within what appears to be a village of a linear form focussed around High Street itself. Buildings within the village often present a frontage or gable form to High Street, and many are constructed on long and relatively narrow plot boundaries extending to the east.
4. To the rear of the site there is an established hedge and neighbouring gardens that partially shields the site from fields beyond. The Countryside Policy Area (CPA) boundary runs to the rear of the property and demarks the edge of the settlement of Austerfield from the CPA. The appeal site extends beyond this line and as such development will be within the CPA area.
5. Policies ENV2 and ENV4 of the Doncaster Unitary Development Plan (UDP) 1998 state the purpose of countryside policy is to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and that development will not normally be permitted unless certain policy criteria are met. The rear of the development would encroach into the CPA and the proposal would not meet any of the criteria. Accordingly, the proposal would conflict with these policies.
6. Several historic buildings survive in the village, including some typical farmsteads that consist of a main farmhouse range to the front with outbuildings to the rear. Sometimes these outbuildings alter in scale from single to two storey and often they are constructed in a linear manner that

reflect the surrounding plot divisions. These frequently allow glimpses and views to the open countryside beyond. I consider therefore that the agricultural built character, linear form and the views that they provide towards the open countryside beyond are strong determinants of the village's overall character.

7. There has been a previous planning permission for this site¹ for 3 new dwellings which would demolish some of the historic farm structures. I have no evidence before me to suggest whether this proposal has been implemented or is still extant. In the absence of any such evidence to the contrary I can therefore only give this previous approval limited weight. In contrast to the previous scheme however, the proposal before me intends to retain these smaller, ancillary buildings, including a modest single storey structure.
8. The proposed new house is of the appearance of a large detached two storey building and would be of a much greater scale than that of other buildings nearby. Such a large structure being located at the very rear of the site would fail to respond to the overall character of the village where more subservient structures are to be generally found the further into a plot one goes.
9. The proposed building is also not of a high enough quality to convincingly reinforce the village's rural character. Although conditions controlling the fenestration of the proposed building could be applied, I do not consider that such conditions could address the more fundamental design issues that will make the bulk and massing of this structure overly dominant within its rural fringe context.
10. Although some glimpses to the open countryside beyond will be maintained in this scheme, these will be significantly reduced and only experienced from well within the site. Therefore an important determinant of the village's defining character will also be harmed.
11. As a result of this there would be a harmful impact upon the character and appearance of the area. Accordingly, I do not consider that the quality design requirements within Policy CS14 of the Doncaster Core Strategy (2012) have been met.
12. Although I am aware of the approved proposal for the Mayflower Public House, that is located adjacent to this site, to extend its car park into the open countryside area, I do not have the information before me to help determine the similarities of this scheme. I do consider however that the impact upon then character and appearance of the village differs substantially between these two schemes and as such I only give limited weight to this example.
13. Section 38(6) of the Town and Country Planning Act 2004 requires me to make my decision in accordance with the plan unless other material considerations prevent me from doing so. In this case I consider that the Doncaster UDP is the up to date policy document upon which to base any decision.
14. I take into account the potential benefits of the new proposal in light of the previous approval on this site. Most notably this benefit includes the current scheme's retention of smaller, ancillary buildings that contribute in a positive manner to the character and appearance of the area. I do not consider however that the retention of these structures and the overall design is of a

¹ Planning Permission ref: 16/01565/FUL

high enough quality to mitigate the policy presumption against development in the Countryside Policy Area.

Conclusion

15. The proposal will result in a harmful encroachment into the Countryside Policy Area and introduce what will be a large residential building on the edge of this characteristic village. I therefore consider that the harm identified has not been outweighed through other considerations and as such consider the proposal to be in conflict with the policies outlined above. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

A. Graham

INSPECTOR