



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 February 2019

by **Matthew Woodward BA (Hons) MA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 28<sup>th</sup> March 2019

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/F4410/D/18/3217353**

**87 Doncaster Road, Tickhill, Doncaster, DN11 9JB**

- 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 Shaun Crummey against the decision of Doncaster Metropolitan Borough Council.
  - The application Ref 18/01183/FUL, dated 11 May 2018, was refused by notice dated 7 September 2018.
  - The development proposed is two storey side extension.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Main Issues

2. The main issues in this appeal are the effect of the proposed development on: (1) the character and appearance of the area; and, (2) the living conditions of the occupiers of 1 and 3 Common Lane having regard to privacy and overlooking.

### Reasons

#### *Character and appearance*

3. No 87 Doncaster Road is a semi-detached dwelling with a pitched roof. Adjoining to the side is a single-storey extension with a flat roof. The property is one of several which lie on a small cul-de-sac, accessed from Doncaster Road down a narrow, private road. Houses within the cul-de-sac are varied in terms of scale, form and design. The adjoining dwelling, No 85, has a single-storey side extension which is well proportioned and subservient to the main dwelling. Therefore, whilst both properties have been extended to the side, they retain their original uniform appearance due to their design, scale and symmetrical form.
4. The proposed extension would be readily visible from the cul-de-sac. The appeal property is positioned behind No 85 and at an approximate right angle when viewed from Doncaster Road. Therefore, views of the appeal property from Doncaster Road are limited and mainly obtainable near the junction of the cul-de-sac. There are distant views of the rear of the appeal site along a short stretch of Common Lane.

5. The proposal involves a two-storey side extension which would replace the existing single-storey side extension and project further to the side. The roof of the extension would be set down in relation to the appeal dwelling. The extension would measure slightly more than the width of the original dwelling. The proposal includes a two-storey gable fronted element which would project out beyond the main building line, on a similar footprint to the existing single-storey extension.
6. The extent and scale of the two-storey side projection, combined with the two-storey front projecting element, would appear overly dominant and would fail to harmonise with the appeal dwelling. This would have an unbalancing effect on the pair of semi-detached properties. Whilst I appreciate that views of the proposal from Doncaster Road would be limited, there are nevertheless other obtainable views, including those from the cul-de-sac. The extension would appear obtrusive when viewed from these receptors and it would have a visually harmful effect upon the character and appearance of the host dwelling.
7. The proposed removal of the existing side extension, the design and appearance of which is at odds with the appeal property, would improve the quality of the dwelling. However, as it is only single-storey, it can clearly be read as a subservient addition. Conversely, the appeal proposal would be much larger in width and two-storeys in height and consequently would fail to harmonise with the appeal dwelling. It would appear out-of-keeping with the street scene.
8. I find that, overall, the proposed extension would appear unduly prominent and would harm the character and appearance of the area. It would be contrary to Policy ENV54 of the Doncaster Unitary Development Plan 1998 which seeks, amongst other matters, to ensure extensions to existing buildings are sympathetic in scale, materials, layout and general design to the existing building. This is generally reflected in Policy DE6 of the Tickhill Neighbourhood Plan. The proposal also conflicts with Policies CS1 and CS14 of the Doncaster Council Core Strategy 2012 in that it would fail to make a positive contribution to character and would fail to enhance the built environment. It would conflict with the Doncaster Development Guidance and Requirements Supplementary Planning Document 2015 (the SPD) in that the extension would appear out of scale and dominate the existing dwelling, harming the character and appearance of the area.

#### *Living conditions*

9. The proposed side extension would include rear facing bathroom and bedroom windows at first-floor level which would face two first-floor rear windows associated with 1 and 3 Common Lane (No's 1 and 3). The SPD guides that extensions should not lead to overlooking of neighbouring dwellings. It also guides that rear and side extensions should be at least 21m from the rear of the nearest neighbouring dwelling. The position of the first-floor windows relative to the first-floor windows in No's 1 and 3 would fall short of the minimum distance required by the SPD. The proposal would result in unacceptable overlooking and loss of privacy for the occupiers of No's 1 and 3. The proposed bathroom window could be obscure glazed to mitigate the impact, but it would not be appropriate to restrict light to the proposed bedroom window by imposing a planning condition requiring obscure glazing.

10. No objections have been received to the proposal from the occupiers of 1 and 3 Common Lane. Additional boundary treatment could be provided between the appeal property and No's 1 and 3. This would ensure no unacceptable overlooking or loss of privacy arising from the proposal in relation to the ground floor windows of No's 1 and 3. This could be secured by planning condition. However, this would not address the impacts I have identified in respect of the proposed first-floor windows.
11. I find that, having regard to the height, proximity, and design, the extension would cause unacceptable harm to the living conditions of the occupiers of 1 and 3 Common Lane by virtue of loss of privacy due to overlooking. The proposal conflicts with Policies CS1 and CS14 of the Doncaster Council Core Strategy 2012 which seeks, amongst other matters, to protect local amenity and ensure new development has no unacceptable effects upon the amenity of neighbouring land uses. Furthermore, the development would conflict with the SPD which seeks to ensure, amongst other matters, that rear extensions do not overlook, overshadow or over-dominate neighbouring properties.

**Other Matters**

12. Representations have been made in support of the appeal proposal from nearby residents, but this is not determinative of the main issue.

**Conclusion**

13. For all of the above reasons, I conclude the appeal should be dismissed.

*Matthew Woodward*

INSPECTOR