



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 January 2020 by Darren Ellis MPlan

Decision by Chris Hoult BA(Hons) BPhil MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21 February 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/F4410/W/19/3239860

1 Bridgeford House, Church Road, Stainforth, Doncaster DN7 5NS

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant outline planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr John Dowse against the decision of Doncaster Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 19/01536/OUT, dated 24 June 2019, was refused by notice dated 9 August 2019.
 - The development proposed is the erection of 2 storey block of 2 No. 1 bedroom apartments.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Preliminary Matters

3. The application was submitted in outline with approval sought for access and layout, with the matters of appearance, landscaping and scale reserved for subsequent approval. I have assessed the appeal proposal on that basis.
4. Two versions of the site plan have been submitted with this appeal, Drawing Nos. 18.015.2 Revision H and Revision I. Both are listed in the appellant's statement however Revision H is marked as superseded. Revision I has been included in Appendix 1 of the Council's statement as the plan relating to the application subject of this appeal, although the plan is not captioned. For the avoidance of doubt, I have used Revision I to determine the appeal.
5. I note the Council's acknowledgement that Policy PH11 of the Doncaster Unitary Development Plan was referred to erroneously in the reason for refusal on the decision notice, and therefore I have had no regard to this policy in my recommendation.

Main Issue

6. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area.
-

Reasons for the Recommendation

7. Bridgeford House houses commercial units on the ground floor and residential apartments above, and has an open area to the side and rear that is currently vacant and partly used for car parking. To the rear of the appeal site is a new housing development, which is separated from the site by Stonyford Drive.
8. Outline planning permission exists for a pair of semi-detached properties¹ on the vacant land to the side of Bridgeford House, fronting onto Church Road, with access and car parking off Stonyford Drive to the rear of the site. The proposal would be accommodated at the rear of the site and would share the access from Stonyford Drive, with an alteration to the proposed car parking layout.
9. Church Road is characterised by properties with commercial units at ground floor and residential accommodation above, with the properties following a linear pattern of development along the street. During my site visit I noticed several buildings to the rear of the properties that front on to Church Road, however these are recognisably ancillary to their host building. Adjacent to the appeal site is a two-storey building that is sited to the rear of a bakery, and this building may have been used as a dwelling in the past. However, unlike the other buildings to the rear of the frontage premises to Church Road, this outbuilding has a frontage to both Church Road and Kingsway. In any event, it is sited within the curtilage of the bakery and it now reads as an ancillary outbuilding rather than a former dwelling.
10. Aside from these outbuildings, and the outbuilding to the bakery at the junction, the rear parts of the plots remain open. This sense of openness can be appreciated in glimpsed views between frontage buildings, although I acknowledge that the buildings to the rear of the funeral services premises are of more substantial construction. This is mirrored on the other side of Stonyford Drive with the new housing development where dwellings having a plot boundary to Stonyford Drive are set well back in order to accommodate sizeable rear gardens. The proposal would disrupt this broadly uniform and discernible pattern of development. It would introduce residential development to a backland area otherwise characterised by open space and outbuildings and would appear out of place. By virtue of its juxtaposition to the bakery outbuilding on the adjacent plot, with only a narrow gap separating it, it would moreover appear cramped.
11. For these reasons, the proposal would cause harm to the character and appearance of the area and therefore would be contrary to policies CS1 and CS14 of the Doncaster Council Core Strategy 2011-2028 (adopted 2012), which require, amongst other things, that development is well designed and reinforces the character of an area.

Other Matters

12. The provision of two additional residential units would make some limited meaningful difference to local housing provision. There would be a social benefit in providing extra housing units, and economic advantages would also arise from the construction and occupation of a new house. However, the benefits of the scheme would not outweigh the harm I have identified.

¹ Planning application ref. 18/02435/OUT

13. At this stage it is not possible to assess the effect the development would have on the occupiers of neighbouring properties, as the matters of appearance, landscaping and scale are reserved to be determined at a later date. However, this does not alter the harm to the character and appearance of the area that I have already highlighted.
14. For the reasons given above, and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

D Ellis

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

15. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

C M Hoult

INSPECTOR