



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 January 2012

by Richard Clegg BA(Hons) DMS MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 31 January 2012

Appeal Ref: APP/F4410/A/11/2164335

Land off Norton Common Road, Askern, South Yorkshire, DN6 9HP

- 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 A Dear against the decision of Doncaster Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 11/02013/FUL, dated 19 July 2011, was refused by notice dated 20 September 2011.
 - The development proposed is described as 'horse stables'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of a stable block on land off Norton Common Road, Askern, South Yorkshire, DN6 9HP, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 11/02013/FUL, dated 19 July 2011, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: A4 location plan, and A1 drawing dated July 2011 showing a site plan, floor plan, elevations and section.
 - 3) No development shall take place until samples of the brick and pantiles to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the building hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Procedural matters

2. On the application form, the location of the site is given as Norton Common Road, Norton. However on the accompanying design and access statement, the decision notice and the appeal form, reference is made to Askern rather than Norton, and I have identified the site accordingly in the appeal details above. The proposed development is more clearly described as the erection of a stable block, and I have considered the appeal on this basis.

Main Issue

3. I consider that the main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the visual amenities of this part of the Green Belt.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is in the Green Belt. The eastern part where the stable block would be erected is a traveller pitch and on the remainder of the site are paddocks on either side of the access track. An adjacent field to the south-west is used by the appellant's family for keeping horses. Planning permission was granted on appeal in 2009 for a mixed use of the keeping of horses and a residential caravan site on the appellant's land. Occupation of the site is restricted to gypsies and travellers, and the permission is for a period of three years, which expires in December 2012.
5. Policy ENV 3 of the Doncaster Unitary Development Plan (UDP) reflects national policy in Planning Policy Guidance Note 2 (PPG2), and restricts development in the Green Belt, except in very special circumstances, to certain specified categories. These include essential facilities for uses of land which preserve the openness of the Green Belt and which do not conflict with the purposes of including land therein.
6. Horses are kept in the paddocks which form part of the appeal site and in the adjacent field, and I have read that Mr Dear's work involves the training and trading of horses. Keeping horses on the appellant's land is a use which preserves the openness of the Green Belt and does not conflict with the purposes set out in PPG2. At present there is no stable building on the land, and I do not doubt, therefore, that the appeal proposal is genuinely required to provide shelter for horses. PPG2 gives small stables for outdoor sport and recreation as a possible example of essential facilities for uses of land which preserve the openness of the Green Belt. The appeal proposal, comprising three stables and a tack room/ store, would be a relatively modest structure, similarly required for an open land use. This type of proposal would not amount to inappropriate development in the Green Belt. However Policy ENV 3 explains that particular proposals are only acceptable in principle, where, amongst other matters, they would not be visually detrimental.
7. The stable building would be relatively modest in size. Its uncomplicated form would be typical of such structures, and would not draw attention to its presence. Both brick and pantiles are evident on buildings in the locality, and the use of these materials would not be inappropriate. The proposed building would be set back from the frontage of the site, which is marked by a tall hedgerow, and it would be positioned against the taller hedge and trees on the south-east boundary. Views from Norton Common Road and from the junction with the A19 to the east would generally be filtered by these hedgerows and those on the frontage of adjacent land. Limited views of the stables would be possible through gaps in the hedge on the north-east boundary of the site and from where there is an open section of frontage on Norton Common Road to the west, and the upper part of the building would probably also be seen above the hedge to the west of the access. However, whilst the building is clearly intended as a permanent structure, it would not be a prominent or intrusive feature in the landscape of this part of the Green Belt, but would respect its setting in accordance with Policy ENV 52 of the UDP. I conclude that the proposed development would not be damaging to the visual amenities of this part of the Green Belt, and that in this respect it would not conflict with Policy ENV 3 of the UDP, or the provisions of PPG2.
8. I am mindful that the temporary planning permission for use of the land south of Norton Common Road for the keeping of horses and as a residential caravan

site expires at the end of this year. This is not a case where the appeal proposal could not properly be carried out or continued separately from that mixed use. Even if no further permission were forthcoming, a stable block within the curtilage identified in the current proposal could be used by the appellant and her family if they lived elsewhere or indeed by another party. In this regard, I note that, in its report on the planning application, the Council takes the view that stabling is an appropriate form of development in the Green Belt. There is no good reason to withhold planning permission for the appeal proposal because of the temporary nature of the extant permission.

9. As precise details of the brick and pantiles have not been specified, samples should be submitted for approval to ensure that the development would be in keeping with its surroundings. A condition is also necessary to ensure that the development is carried out in accordance with the submitted plans for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.
10. For the reasons given above, and having regard to all matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Richard Clegg

INSPECTOR