



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 March 2022

by Paul Cooper MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 30 March 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/F4410/W/21/3286050

37 Allenby Crescent, New Rossington, Doncaster DN11 0JX

- 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 Hollick against the decision of Doncaster Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 21/01759/FUL, dated 21 May 2021, was refused by notice dated 21 September 2021.
 - The development proposed is erection of a detached 4-bedroom dwelling and associated works.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. During the lifetime of the application, it was modified from an outline application to a full application. I have assessed the appeal on the basis of a full application.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The appeal site is the former side garden area to No 37, which has apparently a separate entity, No 37 is an end terraced dwelling located at a junction corner where a cul-de-sac is formed for the next batch of housing. The area is residential in nature and the host property is part of a large housing estate with a set pattern to the highway network and a traditional crescent style layout.
5. The local pattern for dwellings is for semi-detached and terraced units. The corner plots that form the cul-de-sac junctions have large garden areas. Despite some minor variations, these rigid design features set out the character and appearance of the area.
6. The appeal proposals for one detached dwelling harm the character and appearance of the area, introducing a feature that would appear alien in the rigid design strategy of the residential estate and would affect the symmetry at the corner junction of the cul-de-sac.

7. I find that the detached property would be at odds with the prevailing pattern of development in this residential area, and the simple designs and proportions of dwelling types in the locality. The proposed dwelling would fragment and disrupt this pattern, compromising the pattern of development and would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the locality.
8. Whilst there would be sufficient private garden area available for both the new and existing dwelling, the proposed dwelling would appear contrived, being a detached property in a locality dominated by semi-detached and terraced properties and would be at variance with the ordered pattern of development, appearing incongruous in relation to the character and appearance of the area.
9. As a result, I find the proposals contrary to Policy CS14 of the Doncaster Council Core Strategy (2012) and Policies 41 and 44 of the Doncaster Local Plan (2021) which collectively, amongst other matters, expect development to make a positive contribution to character and continuity, respond positively to their context and integrate visually. I also find conflict with the guidance set out in Paragraph 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Other Matters

10. The appellant has made considerable justification for the proposals based on a scheme on a nearby street that gained consent. Whilst on my site visit, I viewed the proposals in question. Although I do not have the full details of the background of this scheme, it is crucially in a different context to that of the appeal property and was also determined under a previous planning regime. It also served to confirm the harm that can be done in relation to inappropriate schemes. I have, in any event, determined this appeal on its own individual planning merits.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above, I therefore conclude that the appeal be dismissed.

Paul Cooper

INSPECTOR