



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 January 2023

by D Barlow BA (Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 8 February 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/F4410/D/22/3309188

23C, Croft Drive, Tickhill, Doncaster DN11 9UL

- 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 and Mrs Wrigglesworth against the decision of Doncaster Council.
 - The application Ref 21/02900/FUL dated 23 September 2021, was refused by notice dated 21 July 2022.
 - The development proposed is a first floor extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area and the living conditions of the occupiers of the neighbouring property with particular regard to outlook and light.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

3. The host property lies in a small cul de sac at the far end of a typical suburban estate of mostly detached brick built houses that sit within the Tickhill Conservation Area (CA). The Conservation Area contains a wide mix of buildings from the historic main street through to more recent developments adjoining it, such as the area around the appeal site to the North.
4. I noticed on my site visit that when viewed from the north, there is an open view through the head of the cul de sac by virtue of the host and neighbouring properties garaging being single storey. There is therefore no sense of enclosure and there is a balanced appearance to the existing layout and design when viewed from the North.
5. The proposed extension would provide a playroom over the existing garage and would raise the ridge height of the currently subservient garage return, which in turn would increase the ratio of brickwork to stone on the property. This would lead to an unbalanced appearance when compared with the adjacent property to the East in terms of scale as it would make the host property far more intrusive and prominent in the street scene. It would also make the existing single storey element less subservient and lead to a bulky and more

dominant projection which would reduce the open views and add to a sense of enclosure looking into the cul de sac from the North.

6. I therefore conclude the proposal would not be sympathetic to the host dwelling in terms of scale, layout or design and would cause harm to the character and appearance of the area. It would conflict with Policy 41 of the Doncaster Local Plan 2015-2035 (Adopted September 2021) (Local Plan) which seeks to ensure that proposals respect and enhance character, local distinctiveness and identity, and Policy DE6 of the Tickhill Neighbourhood Plan (2013-2028) which only supports extensions if they complement and enhance the main building and are proportionate to it in size and scale. These policies are consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework (Paragraph 130) which requires developments to be sympathetic to local character including the surrounding built environment.

Living Conditions

7. When viewed from the rear garden of the neighbouring property (11B Northgate) I noted that the existing garage runs the full length of the garden and although there would be little loss of light due to the orientation of the garage, the proposed extension would nonetheless appear overbearing and undoubtedly reduce the outlook from the rear facing windows and rear garden of this property due to its scale, height and position close to the party boundary.
8. For the above reasons I conclude that the proposal would result in harm to the living conditions of the occupiers of the neighbouring occupiers as a result of the loss of outlook, in conflict with Policy 44 of the Local Plan which aims to protect existing amenity from overbearing development.

Other Matters

9. The Appellants have identified a number of properties where similar designs have been approved in the locality, however they are not in such prominent positions which would affect the street scene directly, as in this case. I have found that the proposal would cause harm to the character and appearance of the area. This harm would be localised however, given the location of the appeal site. In terms of the CA as a whole, I consider that harm would not be caused due to its significance and that the proposal would have a neutral effect and therefore preserve its character and appearance. Accordingly, there would be no conflict with the statutory test set out within section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Area) Act 1990.

Conclusion

10. Thus, for the reasons given above and having considered all matters raised, I conclude that the proposal would conflict with the development plan as a whole and there are no material considerations which indicate a decision other than in accordance with the development plan. The appeal is dismissed.

D Barlow

INSPECTOR

