



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 February 2018

by Elaine Worthington BA (Hons) MTP MUED MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 6th March 2018

Appeal Ref: APP/F4410/W/17/3182158

1 Carlisle Road, Wheatley, Doncaster, DN2 4PT

- 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 Mark Lawton against the decision of Doncaster Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 16/02370/FUL, dated 16 September 2016, was refused by notice dated 4 May 2017.
 - The development proposed is the demolition of the existing attached outbuilding and erection of 2 No 1 bedroom flats with associated parking.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is part of the side garden of a semi-detached dwelling which occupies a corner plot. It is within a residential area of similar properties. The proposal would introduce a detached two storey building comprising two flats and would see the removal of the appeal property's existing outbuilding.
4. Although the appellant considers the site to be within a high density residential area, the houses in the vicinity of the appeal site are for the most part semi-detached and occupy regular plots. Notably the triangular shaped side gardens of the corner properties create open gaps between the houses. The plot that would be created as a result of the appeal proposal would be extremely narrow and constrained in size in comparison to those nearby. As a result of this the proposed building would be positioned very near to No 1. Although it would generally respect the building line of neighbouring No 3, it would also be sited almost right up to both of the site's side boundaries and would effectively fill the width of the plot.
5. This being so, the proposal would appear as an unduly cramped overdevelopment of the modest site that would be out of character with the other properties and more spacious plots in the area. Thus it would stand out as an incongruous and unsympathetic addition to the street scene that would be out of step with the pattern of development nearby and fail to integrate with the character of the surrounding area.

6. The appellant refers to other infill plots and large extensions nearby. However, no further details are given and I saw no such examples in the immediate vicinity of the appeal site at my visit. Whilst the Council cites an example on Crompton Road, in contrast to the appeal proposal I understand that that development is adjacent to a parade of shops. In any event, I am not aware of the circumstances that led to any of those developments and so cannot be sure that they are the same as those in the case before me.
7. I therefore conclude on the main issue that the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the surrounding area. This would be contrary to Policy CS14 of the Doncaster Core Strategy which requires development to be of a high quality design that contributes to local distinctiveness, and (amongst other things) responds positively to existing site features and integrates well with its immediate and surrounding local area. It would also be at odds with the core planning principle of the National Planning Policy Framework to seek to secure high quality design.

Other matters

8. The appellant contacted the Council on a number of occasions to discuss the proposal and no issues regarding the design of the building were raised. However, this is a matter between the appellant and the Council. I confirm that I have considered the appeal proposal on its individual planning merits and made my own assessment as to its impacts.
9. The appellant considers that the proposal would meet the Council's space between dwellings guidelines and its requirements in terms of garden areas. The Council raises no objections to the proposal on these grounds or in terms of its effect on the living conditions of nearby occupiers, car parking or highway safety. The absence of harm in all these regards counts neither for, nor against the proposal.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons set out above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Elaine Worthington

INSPECTOR