
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 April 2018

by Thomas Hatfield BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

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

Decision date: 24th April 2018

Appeal Ref: APP/F4410/D/17/3190296

12 Fairford Close, Cantley, Doncaster, DN4 6PW

- 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 Linda Maguire against the decision of Doncaster Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 17/01520/FUL, dated 13 June 2017, was refused by notice dated 5 September 2017.
 - The development proposed is first floor extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the development on the living conditions of the occupiers of No 238 Goodison Boulevard with regard to loss of outlook and overshadowing.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a detached house set within a modern estate. It is part 1 storey and part 2 storeys in height, and its north eastern elevation runs along the boundary with No 238 Goodison Boulevard.
4. At present, the southernmost part of the dwelling is single storey in height and has a pitched roof that slopes away from the boundary. This design limits its impact on the rear of No 238, which has a relatively compact rear garden. The proposed extension would raise the height of this part of the dwelling to 2 storeys. This would create a tall expanse of brickwork in close proximity to the boundary that would effectively enclose the garden to No 238 along one side. It would dominate views from the rear of that property and would have a harmful overbearing effect to users of the garden area. Whilst the current occupier of No 238 has not objected to the proposal, I must take into account the lifetime of the extension and its effect on both current and future occupiers.
5. A series of overshadowing projections have been submitted by the appellant. However, these do not provide details of the extension's effect between 14:00 (when some overshadowing would occur) and 19:00 (when the garden would be entirely overshadowed). It is therefore unclear at what time more than 50% of the garden would be overshadowed. In any case, even if I were to find

that the development would not have a significant effect with regard to overshadowing, that would not alter my concerns in relation to loss of outlook.

6. For the above reasons, I conclude that the development would significantly harm the living conditions of the occupiers of No 238 Goodison Boulevard with regard to loss of outlook. It would therefore be contrary to saved Policy ENV 54 of the Doncaster Unitary Development Plan (1998), and guidance contained in the Development Guidance and Requirements Supplementary Planning Document (2015). This policy and guidance seek to ensure, amongst other things, that new house extensions respect the living conditions of neighbours. The development would also be at odds with the National Planning Policy Framework, which seeks to secure a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings.

Other Matters

7. The appeal site is in a relatively accessible location. However, the proposal is for an extension to an existing property that would not increase the number of bedrooms. Its accessibility therefore does not carry significant weight.
8. The extension would be appropriately designed and would be subservient to the host property. However, that is an ordinary requirement for new house extensions and it does not represent a positive benefit.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the development would significantly harm the living conditions of the occupiers of No 238 Goodison Boulevard with regard to loss of outlook. Whilst the extension would provide additional living space for the occupiers of the host property, that does not alter my view that the appeal should be dismissed.

Thomas Hatfield

INSPECTOR