



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 August 2022

by Paul Cooper MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26 August 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/F4410/D/22/3301725

59 Paxton Crescent, Armthorpe, Doncaster DN3 2AW

- 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 & Mrs Wrenn against the decision of Doncaster Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 20/00556/FUL, dated 22 April 2022 was refused by notice dated 17 June 2022.
 - The development proposed is rear extension and front porch extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed in so far as it relates to the front porch extension. I allow the appeal as it relates to the rear extension at 59 Paxton Crescent, Armthorpe, Doncaster DN3 2AW in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 20/00556/FUL, dated 22 April 2022, subject to the following condition:-
 - 1) Within three months of the date of this permission, the external walls of the rear extension hereby permitted shall be rendered in a colour to be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority, and the single-storey outbuilding shall be demolished, and the material removed from site and disposed of at a licensed facility.

Procedural Matter

2. The application form to the Council was completed by Mr Andrew Cockcroft, who was the builder for the proposal at the time. In error, Mr Cockcroft, completed the form and listed himself as agent and applicant. Ownership certificates were completed on behalf of Mr & Mrs Wrenn. It only came to light when the new agent for the appeal listed Mr & Mrs Wrenn (the homeowners) as the appellants and prepared a Statement of Case on their behalf.
3. Mr Cockcroft has subsequently declared in writing that the application form was completed in error with his name as applicant. Having visited the site, I can confirm that Mr & Mrs Wrenn are the homeowners and appellants and neither party has been prejudiced by the correction of the information.

Main Issue

4. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area. In light of the separate aspects of the proposal, I will subdivide this into sections relating to the rear extension and the front porch.

Reasons

5. The appeal property is located in an area made up of predominately residential development. The property is part of a terraced row, with some front gables to properties at points within the row (including the appeal dwelling), but the dwellings are of a greater size than a traditional terraced row, typical of the properties constructed of that time within the mining villages of South Yorkshire, housing families connected with mining. Many front garden areas have been converted to off-street parking facilities for the residents and some have made external alterations of various types.
6. There is access to the rear of the properties from a track, and the appellant and some other residents have also used this to park at the rear and many have garages located to the rear of their properties in the private amenity space.
7. The proposals would see the retention of a single-storey rear extension, the demolition of an existing rear single-storey outbuilding and the construction of a single-storey front porch.

Rear Extension

8. The rear amenity space of the appeal property is dominated by a single-storey structure that is a single-storey garage building with a side single storey attachment that was described as a summerhouse, containing a hot-tub and a storage area. There is a canopy area to the front of the summerhouse that effectively creates a covered area.
9. The single-storey outbuilding to be demolished is located close to the appeal dwelling and close to the boundary with 61 Paxton Crescent. It is of brick and tile construction and appears to be used for storage purposes. Its demolition would clear some amenity space to the rear of the property, making a shared access more available and would not harm the character and appearance of the area.
10. At present, to the rear of the appeal dwelling and the rear of a number of properties along the terraced row, including the adjacent dwellings there are a number of structures and outbuildings that have been constructed. I find that to penalise the appeal property for the rear extension as being harmful to the character and appearance of the area is somewhat disingenuous when most of the character is formed by the plethora of buildings to the rear at a number of properties, and these cannot be seen within the street scene in any event.
11. With regard to this element of the proposal, I find that there would be sufficient amenity space available for the use of the property after the demolition of the single-storey outbuilding, and the single-storey extension that is the subject of this appeal is already in-situ and does not affect the amenities of the adjacent properties. A condition to ensure that the extension is rendered to the satisfaction of the Council will be acceptable in terms of external appearance.

12. With regard to this part of the proposal, I find no conflict with policies 41 and 44 of the Doncaster Local Plan (2021) (the LP) which, amongst other matters, expect development to respond positively to their context and site features, integrate visually and functionally and have adequate amenity space. I also find no conflict with the Transitional Design Guidance (2022) and the guidance in relation to design and amenity set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework).

Front Porch

13. The proposal would also include the enlargement of the hallway and utility area, In terms of projection for the porch and its relation to the adjacent property (No 57) there would be some afternoon overshadowing to the ground floor window.
14. With regard to the appearance of the front extension, there is an element of symmetry to the terraced row of properties, and the use of front gables in the overall row design is an interesting feature that adds character to the area. There has undoubtedly been some alteration and extension to properties over the passage of time, including the use of bay windows to the front elevation in some cases, and also many of the properties have converted front garden areas to off-street parking areas.
15. Nonetheless, despite these changes, there still remains a general symmetry to the row. The addition of a front porch extension to the property would undermine that symmetry and I find that this would cause harm to the character and appearance of the area.
16. With regard to the front porch, I find conflict with Policies 41 and 44 of the LP, which collectively expect development to respond positively to their context and site features and integrate visually and functionally. I also find conflict with the guidance set out in Paragraphs 130 and 134 of the Framework.

Conditions

17. The Council have suggested the standard conditions, but as I am issuing a split decision, there is only the relevance of the rear extension. This aspect of the development is already built, so there is no requirement for a standard commencement condition, approved plans conditions or matching materials condition.
18. However, there is a need to ensure that the blockwork construction is rendered, to the approval of the Local Planning Authority, as well as ensuring the rear outbuilding is demolished and removed safely from site and disposed of, in the interests of visual and residential amenity. I have set a time limit for these works to be carried out of three months, which should be more than sufficient.

Conclusion

19. For the reasons set out above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I consider that the appeal should fail in respect to the front porch extension but succeed in respect to the rear single storey extension. A split decision is therefore issued.

Paul Cooper

INSPECTOR