



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 September 2018

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

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 11<sup>th</sup> October 2018**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/F4410/W/18/3203023**

**63 Woodfield Road, Balby, Doncaster DN4 8HB**

- 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 Adrian Kadria against the decision of Doncaster Metropolitan Borough Council.
  - The application Ref 16/02589/FUL, dated 12 October 2016, was refused by notice dated 20 November 2017.
  - The development proposed is a conversion and extension of the existing dwelling to form six apartments.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a conversion and extension of the existing dwelling to form six apartments at 63 Woodfield Road, Balby, Doncaster DN4 8HB in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 16/02589/FUL, dated 12 October 2016, subject to the following conditions:
  - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
  - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plan: 016/057/PD/REV C.
  - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
  - 4) The development hereby permitted shall not be brought into use until a crossing over the footpath and verge has been constructed in accordance with a scheme that has been previously approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

### Procedural Matters

2. The description of development set out in the banner heading and the decision paragraph above reflects that during the course of the planning application an amended plan was submitted that reduced the number of the proposed apartments to 6. Accordingly, I have determined the appeal on this basis.
3. The revised National Planning Policy Framework (2018) has been published during the course of the appeal. In the interests of fairness, the appellant and the Council were given the opportunity to comment on this matter.

## **Main Issue**

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

## **Reasons**

5. The appeal property comprises of an end of terrace 2 storey house which is located on a crossroads and faces towards Woodfield Road. It is found on a comparatively large corner plot of land, with a side garden area extending up to the Kent Road boundary. The roof of the property is hipped in its form with a chimney and contains single storey elements to its side and rear. The prevailing forms of development in the area are terraced rows of residential properties, including around the crossroads.
6. The proposal would extend the property to the side so it would be seen as a continuation of the existing terrace. It would maintain the current hipped roof arrangement and appear as a largely sympathetic extension of the terrace. Although it would not include a chimney, a number of other terraced properties in the area do not have such a feature. The porch would be a modest structure and would not detract from its overall appearance.
7. The increased scale that would arise from the proposal would also not be out of keeping in the area, as the terraced blocks are of varying lengths, regardless of the number of units they contain. Nor would the proposal represent an over-intensive development, as there would still be a sizeable amount of the site to the rear that would not contain the built form of the proposal and, as a consequence, a significant gap with the next property would also remain.
8. The existing terraces around the crossroads are already sited nearer than the existing appeal property, and whilst the gap to the Kent Road boundary would be lessened noticeably by the proposal, the effect on the sense of the spaciousness around the crossroads would not be to such an extent that it would render the effect on the local character to be unacceptable. The proposal would also not extend nearer to the Woodfield Road boundary than the existing property. Hence, it would not unduly disrupt the grain and nor would it appear uncomfortable in its surroundings.
9. I am sympathetic to that local residents raised concerns during the planning application related to the effect on the local character and whilst I have carefully considered this matter, for the reasons I have set out, it would not be unacceptable in this regard. In relation to comments made about the existing property, the proposal would be likely to improve its overall appearance.
10. I conclude that the proposal would not have an unacceptable effect on the character and appearance of the building and the area. As such, it would comply with Policy CS14 of the Doncaster Metropolitan Borough Council, Core Strategy 2011-2028 (2012) where it states that all proposals must be of 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. It would also comply with 'Saved' Policy PH11 of the Doncaster Unitary Development Plan (1998) which states that within residential policy areas development for housing will normally be permitted except where, amongst other considerations, the development would be at a density or of a form which

would be detrimental to the character of the surrounding area or would result in an over-intensive development of the site.

### **Other Matters**

11. The proposed extension to the side of the existing building would be sited well off the boundaries with the neighbouring properties, and so it would not have undue adverse impacts on the living conditions of their occupiers, including on privacy and light levels. Similarly, in relation to the proposed rear first floor extension, as it would only extend a modest distance adjacent to the boundary, the effects on the living conditions of the occupiers of the neighbouring property would not be untoward. As regards potential noise, as this would be of a domestic nature, it would not have an unacceptable impact within these residential surroundings.
12. The Council's Highways Officer found the proposal as amended not to be unacceptable in highway safety terms and, whilst I am mindful that a school is found in the vicinity of the site, I see no reasons to disagree as 6 off-street car parking spaces would be provided and with the likely modest levels of associated traffic generation. In relation to the construction period, the associated disruption should be limited with the likely duration of the works. There would also be some economic and social benefits, albeit these would also be limited with the size of the proposal. Matters in relation to the effect on property values are not for my consideration.

### **Conditions**

13. As well as the statutory time limit for implementation (1), I have imposed a condition in the interests of certainty concerning the relevant plan (2). I have also imposed a condition so that the proposal is constructed of the external materials that would match the existing building, in the interests of protecting the character and appearance of the building and the area (3). For similar reasons, as well as related to highway safety, I have imposed a condition concerning footway and verge crossing details (4). Where I have altered the wording of the conditions put forward by the Council, I have done so in the interests of precision, without changing their overall intention.

### **Conclusion**

14. For the reasons set out above, and having regard to all matters that have been raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed subject to the conditions.

*Darren Hendley*

INSPECTOR