
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 November 2016

by Zoe Raygen Dip URP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 21 November 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/F4410/D/16/3158324

72 Cantley Manor Avenue, Cantley, Doncaster DN4 6TN

- 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 Michael Tunney against the decision of Doncaster Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 16/01514/FUL, dated 8 June 2016, was refused by notice dated 9 August 2016.
 - The development proposed is a two storey extension to front.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host building and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. 72 Cantley Manor Avenue is a two storey semi-detached property set within a large residential estate. It is surrounded by semi-detached, terraced and detached properties together with some bungalows. The houses are staggered and therefore there is no uniform building line. Some properties have been altered through extensions to the front elevation, but most are single storey additions. As a result there is a degree of uniformity to the street scene. Front boundary treatment is mainly absent or in the form of low planting, walls or fences. Consequently the road has an open appearance.
 4. The Doncaster Council Development Requirements and Guidance Supplementary Planning Document 2015 (the SPD) states that the design and scale of extensions forward of a front wall of a house, and their distance from the pavement are of paramount importance to the character of a residential area, which may be adversely affected by poor design or uncharacteristic front projections.
 5. The proposed two storey extension to the property would extend about 2.4 metres from the front elevation and be about 2.9 metres in width. It would be lower than the ridge height of the host dwelling and constructed in materials to match. It would therefore appear as subservient to No 72.
-

6. Nevertheless, although the general building line is staggered, No 72 and its attached neighbour form the forward most pair of properties on this part of the road. As a result the addition of the front extension would extend No 72 significantly closer to the road. It would therefore be particularly obtrusive and prominent eroding the openness of the road. Furthermore No 72 sits within a group of three pairs of semi-detached properties that are of a uniform design and character. The extension would form an uncharacteristic front projection which would be highly visible significantly detracting from that uniformity.
7. I had the opportunity to view a similar two storey front extension at 89 Cantley Manor Avenue. However, while No 89 is a similar distance from the road as No 72, it is set behind both 83 and 91 Cantley Manor Avenue. As a result the extension does not extend beyond the front building line and therefore does not have the obtrusiveness that the appeal proposal would have. I also viewed a two storey front extension at 63 Cantley Manor Avenue. However No 63 is a detached house on a corner site set back from the road and does not have the prominence in the street scene that is afforded No 72. Moreover, the addition of only two, two storey extensions within the immediate local area is not sufficient to alter its overall character and appearance.
8. I am aware of the appellant's particular need for the extension to create additional room, but there is no evidence before me to suggest that a less harmful scheme could not achieve the same aims. Thus, I give this requirement limited weight.
9. For the reasons above therefore I conclude that the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area. It would therefore be contrary to Policies CS1 and CS14 of the Doncaster Council Core Strategy 2011-2028 (2012), saved Policy ENV54 of the Doncaster Unitary Development Plan 1998, paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework and the SPD. These require, amongst other things that development should be of high quality design which contributes to local distinctiveness and reinforces the character of the local landscape and building traditions.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons set out above, having had regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Zoe Raygen

INSPECTOR