



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 February 2019

by **J Somers BSocSci (Planning) MA (HEC) MRTPI IHBC**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision Date: 9 May 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/F4410/W/18/3214411

Land to the rear of 10 St. Edwins Close, Dunscroft, Doncaster DN7 4BD

- 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 Watson against the decision of Doncaster Council.
 - The application, ref: 18/01185/FUL, dated 2 May 2018, was refused by notice dated 27 June 2018.
 - The proposal is for 1 new detached house with detached garage (a 4 bedroom dwelling comprising 3 double bedrooms and one single).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main issues

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development upon the character and appearance of the surrounding locality.

Reasons

3. The appeal site lies to the end of a residential cul-de-sac and was once a garage site for the surrounding residents which has since been cleared. Dwellinghouses in the area are generally terraced or semi-detached and two storeys tall with a functional appearance typical of the mid to late 20th Century with a hue of buff/red/brown brick with concrete tiled roofs. The entire area was developed at the same time and follows a very regimented and planned layout with large areas of communal greenspace to the fronts of dwellinghouses and gaps in-between dwellinghouses which enable views to well vegetated rear gardens and open land behind. These visual gaps, along with the regimented planned nature of the streets and the resultant positioning of dwellinghouses, are an integral component of the character of this locality.
4. The proposed scheme would form a substantial detached property that would be located on the former garage site. It would be positioned further back from the other dwellings along the street with a very narrow frontage which would not contain a front boundary wall or follow the building line or general pattern of development in the area.
5. As the end of the cul-de-sac is currently quite open, with clear distinctive gaps to either side, the encroachment of the proposed dwelling into this open area would appear incongruous and cause harm to the general character, layout and appearance of the location. Furthermore, the lack of any boundary treatment and the fact that the proposed building would be detached from the existing dwellinghouses would fail to respect the prevailing character of the locality.

6. Whilst I appreciate the surrounding designs are quite simplistic, there is a general coherence in their form and positioning. The proposed design appears quite discordant when seen in the context of the surrounding dwellinghouses. The roof pitch is much shallower and, given the need to raise floor levels to adhere to Environmental Agency advice with regards to flooding, the walls appear quite elongated, with the first-floor windows sitting under the eaves of the roof and a comparatively large gap between these and the ground-floor windows. Overall, the proposed scheme would have a poor relationship to the existing built form which, together with the overall design and the layout, would appear as a discordant feature.
7. Given the above-mentioned factors, I conclude that the proposed development would have significantly harmful effects on the character and appearance of the area. Consequently, the scheme is contrary to Policy CS14 of the Doncaster *Core Strategy*, which seeks that developments adhere to a number of design principles; and to saved Policy PH11 of the Doncaster *Unitary Development Plan* which, amongst other criteria, seeks a form which would not be detrimental to the character of the surrounding area. Both these policies are supported by the Doncaster Council *Residential Backland and Infill Development Supplementary Planning Document* which seeks to encourage good integration, design and enhancement of local distinctiveness and identity. Further support to these policies is provided by the Doncaster Council *Development Guidance and Requirements Supplementary Planning Document* which seeks to relay key design principles to facilitate high quality design of new developments; and by the South Yorkshire *Residential Design Guide*, which seeks to ensure an appropriate design response and principles are applied across South Yorkshire as a region.

Other Matters

8. I note that the National Planning Policy Framework encourages the development of small sites and making effective use of urban land. Whilst this favours the scheme it does not outweigh the harm I have identified. I note discussion with regards to details within the Auction Catalogue for the sale of the site where the appellant states that the proposal has 'possible development potential.' I note that the documents do not state what type of development would be suitable and that any development would be subject to consent; and that prospective purchasers should make contact with the local planning authority. Whilst it may have been the intention of the Council to dispose of the land, the documents do not convey that any particular use would be appropriate.
9. The appellant considers that as no neighbour representations have been received, it can be deduced that the development would be appropriate and beneficial. This conclusion would be speculative however, and so I have not given significant weight to the lack of any neighbour responses.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above, the appeal is dismissed.

J Somers

INSPECTOR