
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 February 2017

by Helen Heward BSc (Hons) MRTPI

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

Decision date: 14 February 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/F4410/W/16/3161744

En Vogue, 20 Sandringham Road, Intake, Doncaster DN2 5HT

- 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 Nick Davies against the decision of Doncaster Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 16/01779/FUL, dated 11 July 2016, was refused by notice dated 2 September 2016.
 - The development proposed is described as "Demolition of existing garage and erection of a small one bedroom house".
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The effect of the proposal upon the character and appearance of the locality.

Reasons

3. The locality is characterised by wide spacious roads with development to either side set back behind short frontages. Buildings are laid out along relatively uniform building lines. Save for some dormer windows and decorative roof features, dwellings are predominantly two-storey in height with large pitched roofs over and eaves lines above the first floor level, parallel to the road. Notwithstanding a mixture of terraced and semi-detached buildings they all appear to have a consistency of depth and scale. Overall these features combine to give a strong sense of pattern and regularity to the character and appearance of the locality.
 4. The site is at the rear of a plot at the junction of Sandringham Road and Strathmore Road. In the available views it is seen to be closely adjacent to a tall gable end of a short terrace of two-storey dwellings which, together with another similar terrace, extend along this side of Strathmore Road.
 5. The proposed dwelling would be mainly seen adjacent to this gable where it would be set back behind the building line. The dwelling would be smaller in scale, having a noticeably narrower depth and lower ridge than is typical of surrounding dwellings. The combination of these characteristics would make the overall scale and mass of the dwelling appear quite incongruous, particularly when seen juxtaposed against the outline of the large two-storey gable adjacent.
-

6. With this apparent mass, together with a rather high eaves line, a relatively tall front wall and a projecting hipped roof feature to the front, I am not persuaded that the dwelling would appear like a subservient outbuilding. Rather I find that the scale and design would appear awkward and at odds with the characteristics of the locality.
7. The proposed dwelling would replace two flat roof garages and provide some enclosure to an existing gap in the street scene and a set-back would maintain the open views along the front of Strathmore Road and a sense of openness, but these aspects would not mitigate the harm I have found.
8. I conclude that the proposal would be of a detrimental form, harmful to the character and appearance of the locality. It would fail to satisfy the requirement of Policy CS14 of the Doncaster Council Core Strategy 2011-2028, 2012, (CS) that new development achieves a high quality design that contributes to local distinctiveness, reinforces the character of local landscapes and building traditions, responds positively to existing site features and integrates well with its immediate and surrounding local area, and would be contrary to Saved Policy PH11 of the Doncaster Unitary Development Plan, 1998, (UDP), which, amongst other things, seeks to ensure that development is compatible with the character and appearance of the area.

Other Matters

9. There is nothing to say the dwelling would not have adequate amenity space, would adversely impact upon living conditions, or that it would not have good access to local facilities and public transport, a sustainable design and construction, and legible, adaptable and accessible accommodation suitable to the needs of the population. I am not persuaded that these matters mitigate the harm or amount to weight in favour. These and other aspects such as parking provision and separation distances may satisfy various criteria in Policies CS14 and PH11 of the UDP, but this does not mitigate or outweigh the conflict I have otherwise found.
10. I am informed that the owner is seeking to bring the site into economic use but there is scant evidence in this regard. The proposal would add one small house to the mix of accommodation in the locality and make a very small contribution to the aim of CS Policy CS12 to create mixed communities. However there is no evidence about housing need or market demand. The weight I attach to these matters is limited.

Conclusions

11. The proposal would make a very modest contribution to economic development, the supply of housing and creation of mixed communities. These benefits do not outweigh the significant adverse impact upon the character and appearance of the locality. Therefore, and having taken all other matters raised into consideration, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Helen Heward

PLANNING INSPECTOR