



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 June 2021 by Darren Ellis MPlan

Decision by Nick Davies BSc(Hons) BTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15 September 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/F4410/D/21/3272971

89 Stoops Lane, Bessacarr, Doncaster, DN4 7RS

- 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 Choudry against the decision of Doncaster Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 20/03392/FUL, dated 8 December 2020, was refused by notice dated 9 February 2021.
 - The development proposed is described as a 2 storey extn to the side partially over existing side g.f. extn.
-

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.

Procedural Matter

3. The Government published on 20 July 2021 a revised version of the National Planning Policy Framework. Accordingly, and in light of the reference made to the previous iteration of the Framework within the submitted evidence, the parties have been provided with a further opportunity to make submissions in respect of the publication. Any comments which have been received have been taken into account within the appeal decision.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the street scene.

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. The appeal property is a two-storey detached dwelling with a two-storey extension¹ on one side and a single-storey element to the other side. The dwelling also has a centrally positioned front porch, and overall the dwelling has a balanced and largely symmetrical appearance. The proposed development would see the erection of a two-storey side extension in place of the single-storey element.

¹ Planning application ref. 17/02663/FUL

6. The proposed extension would be flush with the existing front elevation of the dwelling and the roof would be the same height as the main roof. The extension would therefore not be subservient to the original dwelling, although it would have the same relationship to the original dwelling as the existing side extension. However, when combined with the existing side extension then the extensions would overwhelm the original dwelling and totally alter its character and appearance. Furthermore, the proposed extension would result in the front porch being off-centre, which would unbalance the appearance of the dwelling and eradicate its symmetry. Consequently, the proposal would not be sympathetic to the proportions or design of the main house.
7. This part of the street is characterised by detached dwellings in generous plots, with a mix of housing designs and materials. The dwellings have varying amounts of separation to the adjacent buildings, and a few of the properties have first-floor extensions above existing garages or two-storey side extensions built up to or close to the boundary. However, no details of any planning permissions for these extensions have been provided, so I do not know whether they were permitted under the same national or local policy context and, consequently, whether these examples are directly comparable to the proposal before me. Moreover, this appeal has been determined on its own merits.
8. In this case, the existing two-storey side extension has been built in very close proximity to the boundary with No 91, with a narrow gap to allow a side path. However, owing to the limited scale of both the single-storey side element at the appeal property and the garage at No 87, there is a generous gap between the dwelling and No 87 at the first-floor level which makes a positive contribution to this part of Stoops Lane.
9. The introduction of built form at first-floor level in this location would add substantial mass to the dwelling, resulting in the apparent bulk of the building being considerably increased. Even though a small gap would remain between the front of the proposed extension and the northern boundary, as a result of the curvature of the plot, the rear of the extension would be immediately adjacent to the boundary of No 87. Although the adjacent building is a single storey garage, the spaciousness around the appeal property would be eroded and as such the dwelling would appear cramped in its plot. Consequently, the proposal would detract from the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the street scene. The use of matching materials and fenestration as proposed would not mitigate this harmful effect.
10. For these reasons, I conclude that the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the street scene. The development would therefore conflict with saved policy ENV54 of the of the Doncaster Unitary Development Plan (July 1998) and the guidance in paragraphs (a) and (b) of section 2.12 of the Development Guidance and Requirements: Supplementary Planning Document (July 2015) (SPD). These all seek to ensure that extensions are sympathetic in scale and general design to the host dwelling.
11. The decision notice also cites a conflict with paragraph (c) of section 2.12 of the SPD, which requires an extension to respect the living conditions of neighbours. The Council states in its delegated report that the proposed extension would not cause any harm to the occupiers of neighbouring

properties and would therefore be policy compliant in this regard. Based on the evidence before me I have no reason to disagree with this conclusion. Paragraph 2.12(c) of the SPD is therefore not relevant to the reason for refusal.

Other Matters

12. I understand the appellant's desire to provide additional and enhanced habitable space for his family. This private benefit of the proposal carries limited weight in favour of the scheme but does not outweigh the harm that has been identified.
13. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I find that there are no material considerations that indicate the appeal should be determined other than in accordance with the development plan. For the reasons given above, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

Darren Ellis

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

14. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and, on that basis, I agree with the recommendation and shall dismiss the appeal.

Nick Davies

INSPECTOR