



---

# Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 July 2017

**by Darren Hendley BA(Hons) MA MRTPI**

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

**Decision date: 11<sup>th</sup> August 2017**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/F4410/D/17/3174705**

**Crossways, Common Lane, Norton, Doncaster DN6 9HZ**

- 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 Andrew Evans against the decision of Doncaster Metropolitan Borough Council.
  - The application Ref 17/00240/FUL, dated 30 January 2017, was refused by notice dated 23 March 2017.
  - The development proposed is a single storey front, side and rear extension and dormer.
- 

## Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

## Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the building and the area.

## Reasons

3. The appeal property comprises a bungalow that has been extended to the side and rear, and a detached garage. It is located on a corner plot and contains a long site frontage onto Common Lane and Pinfold Lane. This frontage is defined by a low stone wall with infrequent trees of a modest height set behind the wall. Properties on both Common Lane and Pinfold Lane in the vicinity of the site are also predominately bungalows, and this is a defining characteristic. A bungalow is also under construction at the rear of the appeal site. At the time of my site visit, a mobile home was on the site.
4. The proposal would noticeably increase the scale of the existing bungalow with the sizeable increase of the height of the roof ridge and the footprint size, and with the introduction of the two gable ends on the front elevation that would be both two storeys. The scale of the proposal would be substantially greater than the bungalow properties in the vicinity of the site.
5. The site is prominent due to its location on the corner and with its long frontage affording extensive views from the streetscene. The proposal would also be located closer to the site frontage than the existing bungalow, in particular when nearest Pinfold Lane. When the prominence of the siting of the proposal is combined with the scale, it would appear dominant and markedly out of keeping with the area. The front boundary treatment and the trees would not provide any substantive screening due to their limited height.

6. The site's corner location also gives it a sense of spaciousness that adds appreciably to its own character and lessens to reduce the overall density of development in the area. This role of the site would be substantially reduced with the scale of the proposal and so this would also be to the detriment of its contribution to the character of the area. The property would be left with a reasonable amount of usable garden space, but this does not alter my conclusions over this loss of the site's spaciousness.
7. No 1 Pinfold Lane, adjacent the site, has been extended, including an increase in the height of the roof to create first floor accommodation. It is however located on a less prominent site and still presents some the attributes of a bungalow form, by maintaining a front eaves height at single storey level with the roof slope angling back to the dormers. With the scale and prominence of the proposal, it would not significantly reflect the form of development that has taken place at No 1. Nor would it reflect the design characteristics of the other properties on Pinfold and Common Lane nearest the site, with their predominant single storey form, design and appearance.
8. I conclude the proposal would have an unacceptable effect on the character and appearance of the building and the area. It would not comply with Policy CS14 of the Doncaster Local Development Framework Core Strategy (2012) and 'Saved' Policy ENV54 of the Doncaster Unitary Development Plan (1998) which state that proposals must be of high quality design that contribute to local distinctiveness and should be sympathetic, including in scale to the existing building.
9. Paragraph 56 of the National Planning Policy Framework (Framework) establishes that Government attaches great importance to the design of the built environment. The proposal would not comply with paragraph 60 which states that whilst planning decisions should not make unsubstantiated requirements to conform to certain development forms or styles, it is proper to promote or reinforce local distinctiveness. It would also not comply with similar advice in the Council's Development Guidance and Requirements: Supplementary Planning Document (2015) which sets out the importance of good design and this should be informed by the character of the area.

### **Other Matters**

10. The site benefits from a proximity to bus stops and highways infrastructure that allow access to services in Doncaster and other settlements, and the proposal constitutes the redevelopment of a site that has already been developed; however these neither address nor outweigh my concerns over the effect on character and appearance, given the importance which is attached to good design.
11. Whilst the proposal would be acceptable with regard to highways safety and the effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of adjacent properties, these are neutral matters and therefore do not weigh in favour of the proposal. Nor would conditions address my concerns over character and appearance. I also note comments made about pre-application discussions and how this has informed the planning application and the purchase of the property, although these are not matters for me to comment on in the context of this appeal.

**Conclusion**

12. I conclude the appeal should be dismissed.

*Darren Hendley*

INSPECTOR