



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 November 2020

by Paul Cooper MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 8 December 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/F4410/D/20/3260830

7 Stripe Road, Rossington, Doncaster DN11 0HZ

- 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 Michael Whitehead against the decision of Doncaster Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 20/02031/FUL, dated 27 July 2020, was refused by notice dated 28 September 2020.
 - The development proposed is erection of boundary wall to side and front (1 metre high with a further 1 metre high railing inserts and pillars).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is located on the corner of Stripe Road and Sylvestria Court. Whilst there are some properties opposite on Pheasant Bank that have hard boundary treatments to the frontage, these are generally low in height and are set back from Stripe Road, unlike the appeal property and proposals. At present the majority of frontages on Stripe Road and Sylvestria Court have open frontages or planting. This gives the street scene an overall pleasant character.
4. While I note that the section facing Stripe Road is to be set behind the existing planting, it would be easily visible behind the planting and therefore incongruous and harmful to the character of the area. In addition to this, the planting could be removed, exposing the harshness of the boundary treatment and its design fully to the street scene.
5. The proposed side boundary treatment facing onto Sylvestria Court would be largely exposed, and look out of place within that street scene, where the properties have either planted or open frontages, and the incongruousness of the structure would be harmful to the character of that street scene.
6. I note the frustrations of the appellant in regard to a number of other boundary treatments in the locality that the Council have permitted or not taken action against. I do not have the full details of these schemes, but nonetheless the existence of these other boundary treatments do not justify further harm to the character and appearance of the locality.

7. I have taken into consideration the appellants reasoning for the erection of the boundary treatment proposed, but this does not outweigh the harm that I have identified by the appeal proposal.
8. I conclude that the development harms the character and appearance of the area and is in conflict with Policy CS14 of the Doncaster Council Core Strategy (2012) which states that, amongst other matters, development proposals should be robustly designed, work functionally, attractive and make a positive contribution.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons outlined above and having regard to all matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Paul Cooper

INSPECTOR