
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 31 May 2022

by Steven Hartley BA (Hons) Dist.TP (Manc) DMS MRTPI MRICS

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16 June 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/F4410/D/22/3296870

1 Highfield Road, Bawtry, Doncaster DN10 6QN

- 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 Mark Keogh against the decision of Doncaster Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref: 21/02276/FUL, dated 16 July 2021, was refused by notice dated 14 February 2022.
 - The development proposed is a new roof to the dwelling to provide 2 number usable bedrooms with a porch at ground floor level.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for a new roof to the dwelling to provide 2 number usable bedrooms with a porch at ground floor level at 1 Highfield Road, Bawtry, Doncaster, DN10 6QN in accordance with the terms of application 21/02276/FUL, dated 16 July 2021, and subject to the following conditions:
 - i) The development hereby permitted shall begin no later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - ii) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: existing and proposed elevations and first floor – ref 21-482/01 dated June 2021; existing and proposed ground floor plan – ref 21-482/02 dated August 2021 and site location & layout plans ref 21-482/03 dated June 2021.
 - iii) The external materials for the roof and for the roofs to the proposed dormers shall match the existing roof materials currently on the building.

Procedural Matter

2. The appellant states that the proposed development would raise the ridge of the existing building by 1.08 metres while the local planning authority (LPA) states that it would be by 1.3 metres. While I do not consider the difference between the main parties to be material to my decision, for the avoidance of doubt I have determined the appeal based upon the submitted plans.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed alterations to the roof upon the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal dwelling is located at the head of a cul-de-sac on Highfield Road. The cul-de-sac is a small development of mainly bungalows distinct from other properties on Highfield Road containing two storey dwellings. The bungalows generally have hipped roofs and have a similar design and height, though the appeal dwelling and its immediate neighbour have larger footprints.
5. The appeal dwelling, while having a comparable roof height to the other dwellings in the cul-de-sac, its overall size and shape varies considerably from the neighbouring dwellings. It is sited at the very end of the cul-de-sac and is set behind a boundary brick wall which is approximately 2 metres high.
6. The proposed development is to increase the height of the roof, the hipped roof on the north-eastern side would become a gable, and dormer windows would be constructed to the rear and front elevations. A porch is also included.
7. The reason for refusal does not refer specifically to the replacement of the hipped roof to a gable, though this would raise the height of the roof at this point. Nor does it refer to the inclusion of new dormers or to the ground floor porch. However, the LPA, in its officer report, considers that the proposed change from the hipped roof to a gable on the northeast elevation would be out of character with the area. The appeal property already has a gable over the garage part of the dwelling and there is a mix of gables and hipped roofs in the area. Therefore, I do not find that the proposed change from a hipped roof to a gable to the northeast elevation would adversely affect the character and appearance of the area.
8. So far as the proposed dormer windows are concerned, the officer report refers to an earlier approval for alterations to the property which includes dormers.¹ While I have no details before me regarding the earlier approval, I find that the dormers proposed, by their limited height and size, would be proportionate to the scale of the dwelling and would have an acceptable impact upon the character and appearance of the area.
9. The LPA does not raise an objection to the proposed porch, and I see no reason to disagree.
10. So far as the proposed raising of the roof is concerned, including its altered pitch, I do not find that the limited change to its height or to the pitch would be so significant as to be particularly discernible to the passer-by or to appear incongruous in the immediate locality.
11. In reaching the above conclusion, I have taken into account the fact that the appeal property is the last one at the head of the cul-de sac rather than being in the middle of existing houses. Consequently, the proposed change would be less anomalous or noticeable in the street-scene. In addition, it would be

¹ 86/1032/P

viewed against the background of the higher, two storey dwellings further along the main part of Highfield Road and which are visible from the appeal property.

12. Therefore, I conclude that the proposed development would not conflict with policy 41 of the Doncaster Local Plan 2021 which requires development to recognise and reinforce the character of the locality.

Planning conditions

13. I have imposed the standard time condition and a condition to ensure the development is in accordance with the approved plans in the interests of certainty. In the interests of the character and appearance of the area and good design, it is also necessary to impose a materials condition.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons given above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Steven Hartley

INSPECTOR