



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 August 2019

by Graham Wraight BA(Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26 September 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/F4410/W/19/3231113

Stone Cross Manor, School Lane, Old Cantley, Doncaster DN3 3QG

- 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 Mr Kelvin Askew against the decision of Doncaster Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 18/02783/OUT, dated 5 November 2018, was refused by notice dated 21 December 2018.
 - The development proposed is an outline application for a dwelling and conversion of stables to garage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The application is submitted in outline form with all matters reserved for later consideration. Therefore, whilst plans have been submitted suggesting how a dwelling could be accommodated on the site, these have been provided for indicative purposes only.
3. Since the planning application was determined, a revised version of the National Planning Policy Framework (The Framework) has been published in February 2019. I have therefore based my considerations on this most recent version of The Framework.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development upon the character and appearance of the countryside.

Reasons

5. The appellant argues that the Doncaster Council Core Strategy (CS) Policies CS2 and CS3 are out of date and also that the Doncaster Unitary Development Plan (UDP) Saved Policies ENV2 and ENV4 are out of date. He cites their age as a factor and because CS2 advocates a settlement hierarchy. However, there is nothing in the Framework that presumes against a settlement hierarchy. As the appellant acknowledges, policies have to be considered against their consistency with the Framework and he has not provided detailed evidence that they are inconsistent with it. That said, overall, the Council's policies for the protection and enhancement of the countryside are somewhat more restrictive than that advocated by the Framework. However, the Framework also

recognises the character and beauty of the countryside and I do not consider that the development plan policies are so inconsistent with the Framework that the tilted balance is engaged.

6. The appellant has drawn attention to two previous appeal decisions which refer to the tilted balance set out in The Framework. However, these are in different local authority areas and are not directly relevant to this appeal.
7. The site forms part of a large plot of land associated with the dwelling at Stone Cross Manor. The site is outside of any defined settlement limit and although Stone Cross Manor is to one side, it is mostly separated from other development by fields. Although close to both Old Cantley and to the urban edge of Doncaster, the site and its surroundings are distinctly separate to the built up area and they have an open and rural character and appearance.
8. Whilst there is already a stable block building located on the site, the proposed development would result in a new dwelling where there is currently no built development. This would be an encroachment upon the countryside and would result in an urbanising appearance of the site and a loss of open character. The Framework indicates that planning should recognise the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside and, due to the consequent erosion of the countryside, the proposal would not do this.
9. In conclusion, the proposed development would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the countryside and would conflict with the objectives of Policies CS2 and CS3 of the CS and Policies ENV2 and ENV4 of the UDP, which seek to protect the countryside.

Other Matters

10. The Council has an up to date supply of land for housing. The proposed development would provide one new dwelling in a location which would offer a choice of modes of travel. However, it would make only a very limited contribution to boosting the supply of housing. The economic and social benefits, for example from residents using local facilities would also be limited due to the small scale of the proposal.
11. Taken together, the economic, social and environmental considerations presented by the appellant offer only limited weight in support of the proposed development. They do not however outweigh the significant harm to the countryside that I have identified and the conflict with the CS and UDP Policies.

Conclusion

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

Graham Wraight

INSPECTOR