



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 June 2020

by Darren Hendley BA(Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 8th July 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/F4410/D/20/3252244

Elm Tree Cottage, Teapot Corner, Clayton, Doncaster DN5 7DB

- 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 Mrs James against the decision of Doncaster Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref: 19/02692/FUL, dated 31 October 2019, was refused by notice dated 24 February 2020.
 - The development proposed is an extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for an extension at Elm Tree Cottage, Teapot Corner, Clayton, Doncaster DN5 7DB in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref: 19/02692/FUL, dated 31 October 2019, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Proposed Planning plans (Site Plan 1:500, Site Location Plan 1:1250, Proposed Side Elevations 1:100, Proposed Front Elevation 1:100, Proposed Rear Elevation 1:100, Proposed Ground Floor Plan 1:50, Proposed First Floor Plan 1:50)
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is whether the proposal would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Clayton Conservation Area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property comprises a mainly 2 storey cottage which lies within the conservation area and on the edge of the village. It is linear in its form and it has a single storey side extension. A number of other alterations to the property have taken place, including to the roof and windows. It forms one of a pleasing group of 3 cottages that are positioned fairly close together at the end of Teapot Corner. The gable end of the appeal property which faces this

grouping is prominent. Wider visibility is, however, limited past where Teapot Corner joins Tan Pit Lane.

4. The historical significance of the conservation area is largely defined by the rural character of the village. The part where the site is found contains a fairly close knit arrangement of mainly cottage type properties, like the appeal property. There are also some more modern infill dwellings. The countryside surroundings permeate into the village and influence its character by virtue of the proximity of fields and a largely undeveloped valley bottom.
5. The proposed extension would project outwards from the south elevation of the property into a garden area. It would still maintain a broadly linear appearance because of the overall shape of the extended cottage, when the proposed elevation and floor plans are considered together, and as the gable ends would continue to extenuate the linear form. It would not result in an unbalanced appearance, in particular with the distances it would be set-in from the ends of the property and as its height would be considerably less than that of the existing main roof ridge.
6. The lean to form of the proposed extension with a catslide roof is also not an uncommon feature in traditional rural areas. This element would not diminish from the strong form of the gable end which faces the grouping of the cottages because it would be well set back from this side elevation. The proposed dormer would be admittedly a less common feature. However, it is fairly modest in its proportions compared to the overall size of the roof plane and so it would not unduly detract from the building. It would also be well set back from views from Teapot Corner and there would be limited visibility beyond.
7. Alterations to the cottages in this part of the conservation area are not uncommon. They still contribute favourably to the significance and give a sense of individual interest. Hence, like the appeal property, they are not uniform or overtly simple buildings. The design and mix of styles that would result from the proposal would, thus, not be out of keeping and nor would it appear suburban in these surroundings. The property would still have the appearance of a rural cottage on the edge of the village and maintain its historical character. In addition, it would not lessen the contribution of this grouping of cottages to the significance.
8. I conclude that the proposal would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the conservation area. As such, it would comply with Policy CS15 of the Doncaster Council Core Strategy 2011-2028 (2012) and with Saved Policy ENV25 of the Doncaster Unitary Development Plan (1998) which seek to protect, preserve and enhance the historic environment, including that extensions will be expected to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of conservation areas, amongst other matters.
9. It would also comply with paragraphs 190, 192, 193 and 200 of the National Planning Policy Framework where they are, collectively, concerned with conserving and enhancing the historic environment. As I do not find harm, there is not a need to consider the public benefits for the purposes of a balancing exercise under paragraph 196.

Conditions

10. In addition to the timescale for implementation, I have imposed a condition concerning the approved plan for the purposes of certainty. I have also imposed a condition by way of matching external materials to the existing building. This is in order to protect the character and appearance of the building and the area.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons set out above and having regard to all matters that have been raised, the appeal should be allowed subject to the conditions.

Darren Hendley

INSPECTOR