

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 February 2023

by John Whalley

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21st February 2023

Appeal ref: APP/A3010/D/22/3310091

2 Church Lane, Miserton, Doncaster DN10 4AL

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal of planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr C and Mrs I Cooke and Mr S McDonald against the decision of Bassetlaw District Council.
 - The application, ref. 21/01011, dated 25 June 2021, was refused by a notice dated 4 October 2022.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a single storey detached garage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed and planning permission is refused.

Main issue

2. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposed detached garage on the setting of the Grade I listed Church of All Saints, Miserton.

Reasons

3. All heritage assets have a setting, irrespective of the form in which they survive and whether they are designated or not. The setting of a heritage asset and the asset's curtilage may not have the same extent. But the approach from the B1403 Church Street in Miserton along Church Lane to the Grade I listed Church of All Saints is clearly part of the attractive setting to the historic church, particularly evident along the southern side of Church Lane where recent buildings have ensured that no harm has been caused to the setting.
4. The appeal property, No. 2 Church Lane was, together with the dwelling No. 2a, built some 10 years ago to a design that took careful cognisance of that setting and the proximity to the church. The development of those 2 houses has demonstrated that new development can, if well designed with a suitable appreciation of the importance of the setting, achieve acceptable results.
5. The appeal proposal is that a single storey detached garage is built to the north-eastern corner of the No. 2 plot, in front garden of the dwelling, close to the wall along Church Lane. Its position would reflect that of the garage built at the house next door, No 2a, Farriers Cottage. Unlike the Farriers Cottage brick built garage, the appeal garage would be timber framed, with cedar board cladding walls and cedar shingles to the roof.

6. I share the Council's conclusion that the use of those building materials would be unsuitable and unacceptable. Whilst cedar wood has a number of virtues, including a natural durability and can have an attractive appearance, I consider their finishes in this part of the setting to the listed Church of All Saints would appear incongruous and poorly related to the construction materials of the church and the other newer buildings that sit well in this part of the setting to the church.
7. S.66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings & Conservation Areas) Act 1990 says, amongst others, that the Secretary of State shall have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses. The Appellants suggested that the Council were prepared to allow the construction of a brick built garage. That may be. But I consider that they took the not unreasonable view that the use of non-traditional and non-matching facing materials would fail to preserve the setting of this significant designated heritage asset. The cedar wood clad garage would appear incongruous and unfitting in the front garden of No. 2 Church Lane.
8. In concluding that planning permission for the proposed cedar wood garage should not be granted, I note that Policy DM4 of the Bassetlaw Core Strategy says all development proposals will need to be in keeping with the character and appearance of the wider area and when they are in historic locations, they should respect existing development patterns. The appeal project does not meet that requirement.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons outlined above, and taking into account all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

John Whalley

INSPECTOR