



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/22/3302315

45 Cherry Tree Drive, Dunscroft, Doncaster DN7 4JZ

- 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 Michael Witton against the decision of Doncaster Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 21/01503/FUL, dated 29 April 2021, was refused by notice dated 21 April 2022.
 - The development proposed is erection of a single storey front garage extension, a two-storey side extension and a supported canopy to the front elevation.
-

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 a detached dwelling located in a predominately residential area. The locality is made up of detached and semi-detached dwellings, some of which already benefit from extensions. Despite some variation in form, the properties in the area present a discreet arrangement that contribute towards local character.
4. The proposal would see the erection of a two-storey side extension with a single storey garage attached to front of that, forward of the front elevation, and a supported canopy to the existing front elevation.
5. I find that due to the scale and forward projection combination of the two-storey side extension and the front garage extension, it would appear dominant and incongruous in the context of both the host property and the street scene. Such an overwhelming departure from the established built form would be inconsistent and appear unsightly. It would result in a front projecting single-storey garage protruding from the original building line of the dwelling, being of significant scale and to the detriment of the host dwelling.
6. The design, scale and siting would significantly unbalance the harmony of the appeal property and would be at odds with the simple design nature of the existing property, appearing uncharacteristic and cause material harm to the character and appearance of the locality with the introduction of such a dominant feature that is at odds with the aesthetics of the area.

7. Thus, it would appear overpowering to the frontage and out of character with the architectural style of the host dwelling. Furthermore, it would not be reflective of the street scene creating an unwelcome focal point at this junction location, appearing as an incongruous addition, disrupting the rhythm and scale of existing dwellings within the street scene.
8. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the combination of the two-storey side extension and the single-storey front garage extension would harm the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.
9. As a result, I find that it would be contrary to policies 41 and 44 of the Doncaster Local Plan (2021) which collectively, amongst other matters, expect development to be of high-quality design, contributing to local distinctiveness, integrate visually with the surrounding area at a settlement and be sympathetic to the character of the area.
10. I also find conflict with the guidance set out in Paragraph 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework and that of the Doncaster Development Guidance and Requirements Supplementary Planning Document (2015).

Other Matters

11. I have noted the comments of the appellant regarding the inconsistency of decision making from the Council, and the submission of similar proposals that have gained approval.
12. I do not have the full details of these alternative proposals, and I have to determine the appeal on the merits of the case in front of me. I have identified harm to the character and appearance of the area with regard to this appeal and the presence of other similar development to the appeal proposals in another context does not make the proposal acceptable.

Conclusion

13. The proposal conflicts with the development plan, taken as a whole and there are no other material considerations, which outweigh this finding. Therefore, for the reasons given, the appeal is dismissed.

Paul Cooper

INSPECTOR