



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 May 2024

by Thomas Hatfield BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 06 June 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/A3010/W/23/3328932

Filling Station, Great North Road, Scrooby, Doncaster, DN10 6AU

- 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 Stephen Hastings against the decision of Bassetlaw District Council.
 - The application Ref 23/00034/FUL, dated 11 January 2023, was refused by notice dated 28 June 2023.
 - The development proposed is described as "*demolition and erection of 1 No. two storey dwelling*".
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the development, firstly, on the character and appearance of the area and, secondly, on the setting of the Grade II* listed Church of St Wilfrid.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The appeal site consists of a relatively small, narrow piece of land on the eastern side of Great North Road that is used as a car dealership. It largely consists of hardstanding but contains a small single storey building.
4. The development would introduce a large, detached 2 storey property that would occupy much of the width and depth of the site. It would be a relatively wide structure positioned close to the back edge of the footway. Its size, proximity to the road, and its large front projecting gable would result in a domineering and highly prominent structure that would draw the eye in views along the street. Due to its size and position, it would also appear visually cramped within the site, which is small in scale. In my view, it would be an incongruous feature that would be out of keeping with its surroundings.
5. It is asserted that the development could incorporate a hedge across its frontage that would match other hedgerows along this side of the road. However, the proposed site plan shows an uncharacteristically open frontage, with only limited sections of hedgerow on either side. Moreover, given the proximity of the dwelling to the road, it is unclear whether there would be

space to accommodate a high boundary hedge along the frontage. Any such hedge would also be in close proximity to front living room and kitchen/dining room windows and so future occupiers would be unlikely to tolerate a tall hedge in this position.

6. It is also asserted that the existing building and site layout are unattractive and allow views of the rear of modern properties fronting Low Road. However, the existing building is modest in scale and its materials largely assimilate with its surroundings. It also allows views across the site of the Grade II* listed Church of St Wilfrid. Whilst it has little historic or architectural interest itself, its presence does not justify the introduction of a significantly larger and more harmful structure, as is proposed here.
7. For the above reasons, I conclude that the development would significantly harm the character and appearance of the area. It would therefore be contrary to Policy DM4 of the Bassetlaw Core Strategy & Development Management Policies DPD (2011) and Policy 6 of the Scrooby Neighbourhood Plan. These policies seek to ensure, amongst other things, that new development is appropriately designed and in keeping with its surroundings.

Setting of a listed building

8. The Grade II* listed Church of St Wilfrid is located around 100 metres from the appeal site at the corner of Low Road and Church Lane. It was built in the 15th and 16th centuries and has a prominent octagonal spire topped with a weathervane. The spire is an important local landmark and is prominent in a number of views from the surrounding area. As well as its architectural interest, the church is associated with the Pilgrim Fathers who travelled to North America on the Mayflower in 1620.
9. At present, views of the church spire are clearly visible across the site from along Great North Road. These views are available both from the pedestrian footway along the site frontage and to passing vehicles, albeit they are partly obscured when intervening trees are in leaf. The development would entirely block these views from along sections of Great North Road, and given its prominence and design, it would negatively affect any such views that remained. The development would therefore harm views of the church spire and how it is experienced from public vantage points. Whilst it is asserted that any boundary hedge would be likely to obscure such views that is not necessarily the case, and in any event it would not do so to the same degree.
10. My attention has been drawn to Map 6 of the emerging Scrooby Neighbourhood Plan, which does not identify this as an important view of the church spire. However, from the information before me, it is unclear how that map was produced and whether it is intended to be comprehensive of all important views of the spire. I have therefore come to my own view on this matter.
11. For the above reasons, I conclude that the development would harm the setting of the Grade II* listed Church of St Wilfrid. This harm would be 'less than substantial' in the context of Paragraphs 207-208 of the National Planning Policy Framework ('the Framework'). However, the public benefits associated with the provision of a new dwelling would not outweigh the harm in this case.
12. The development would therefore be contrary to guidance in the Framework relating to designated heritage assets. It would also be at odds with Policy

DM8 of the Bassetlaw Core Strategy & Development Management Policies DPD (2011), which states that proposals which fail to preserve or enhance the setting of a heritage asset will not be supported.

Other Matters

13. Although not referred to in the reasons for refusal, the Council's Delegated Report states that the development would harm the settings of the Old George & Dragon and Northfield House, which are non-designated heritage assets. However, as I have found that the appeal fails against the main issues, this matter is not determinative in this case.
14. It is asserted that Scrooby is split into 2 character areas; the historic core within the conservation area, and the outer parts of the settlement that are characterised by modern development. However, the purpose of a conservation area designation is not to delineate character areas in this way, and I saw no clear character distinction between these areas during my site visit. In any case, this matter has little bearing on my conclusions regarding the harm that would arise from the development.

Conclusion

15. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Thomas Hatfield

INSPECTOR