
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 June 2020

by Darren Hendley BA(Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 8th July 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/F4410/D/20/3251443

77 Tenter Lane, Warmsworth, Doncaster DN4 9PE

- 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 A. Bailey against the decision of Doncaster Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref: 19/02241/FUL, dated 17 September 2019, was refused by notice dated 14 February 2020.
 - The development proposed was originally described as a "2 storey annexe extension attached to existing semi-detached dwelling house with shared front entrance and utility room. Plus new shared detached double garage with sun room after demolition of existing detached double garage to the rear."
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The description of development that is set out in the banner heading above is taken from the planning application form. During the course of the application, the proposal was amended and the submitted plans do not show a sunroom. Hence, I have considered the appeal on this basis.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are (i) the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the building and the area; and (ii) whether it would be an incidental use to the main dwelling.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

4. The appeal site is located on the corner of Tenter Lane with Fox Grove. The semi-detached house contains single storey side and rear extensions and there is a detached garage to the rear. Tenter Lane consists of mainly semi-detached properties with occasional detached dwellings, whilst Fox Grove leads to a more modern estate type housing development. Around the Tenter Lane and Fox Grove junction, there is a degree of spaciousness with soft landscaping strips. The resultant gap around the junction adds to the overall visibility of the appeal site, in particular the side where the proposal would be sited.

5. The proposed side extension would be of a considerable width compared to the existing house and it would markedly alter its overall appearance. It would not retain the principle form of the existing front elevation as the focal point. The Council's Development Guidance and Requirements: Supplementary Planning Document (2015) (SPD) cautions against side extensions dominating, referring to the width being lesser than the host dwelling. This would not be achieved by the proposed side extension and, accordingly, it would dominate the existing dwelling and not be a subservient element to it.
6. With its size, the proposed side extension would also significantly imbalance the pair of semi-detached properties. That it would be modestly set-back from the front wall of the existing house and set-down from the roof ridge to avoid a terracing effect would not adequately overcome this harm. The same applies as regards the open archway form at ground floor level. It would still appear as an uncomfortably large addition.
7. The width of the proposed side extension would project up to the boundary with Fox Grove and then run alongside the boundary for nearly the depth of the house. When the corner plot location is also considered along with the gap around the Fox Grove and Tenter Lane junction, it would be highly prominent, even with the hipped roof arrangement. The upper part of the proposed side extension would still be clearly in view to the detriment of the area above the landscaping alongside Fox Grove.
8. The distance the proposed side extension would be set-back from Fox Grove by the landscaping strip and the footway is also not so great that it would result in the extension being visually accommodated satisfactorily within the site, due to its size. The unfavourable effects would be pronounced.
9. The proposed garage would also be of some size for a domestic outbuilding in these surroundings with its footprint size and as it would take up a not insignificant part of the garden, even compared to the existing garage. Although it would be largely screened, this would not, in itself, justify an otherwise unsatisfactory form of development in character and appearance terms.
10. What variety there is in the designs of other properties in the area does not address the harm because this would arise from the size of the proposal. Nor is such an extension part of the prevailing character by way of precedent. Such extensions, even if they are not an uncommon addition in modern times, still need to be sympathetic to local character and not just in locations that are afforded a protected status.
11. I conclude that the proposal would have an unacceptable effect on the character and appearance of the building and the area. As such, it would not comply in this regard with Policies CS1 (C) (E) and CS14 (A) of the Doncaster Council Core Strategy 2011-2028 (2012) and with Saved Policy ENV54 of the Doncaster Unitary Development Plan (1998) which concern place specific and well-designed development; the qualities of a successful place, including character; and, that extensions should be sympathetic in scale, materials, layout and general design to the existing building, amongst other considerations.
12. The proposal would also not comply with the SPD where it concerns the importance of good design, including for side extensions. It would also not

accord with the National Planning Policy Framework where it involves achieving well-designed places, including high quality design and that decisions should ensure that developments will add to the overall quality of an area, amidst other matters.

Incidental Use

13. The appellants have indicated that the proposed side extension would allow for the occupation of additional family members and for shared use with the existing occupiers.
14. In terms of the proposed layout, there would still be a reliance on the main dwelling for its kitchen facilities. Whilst there would not be a direct access at first floor level, overall, the proposed side extension would be physically and functionally connected to the main dwelling house, in terms of its design. In addition, external access would require either passing through the main dwelling or using a rear door in the proposed extension via the archway, and so it would not be unusually distinct from the main dwelling. In terms of scale, this simply reflects that its use would relate to the greater number of occupiers and its functions.
15. For the purposes of the SPD, the proposed side extension would be attached to the main dwelling, would not be self-contained, have a reliance on the main dwelling and share facilities which include its garden and its access. The potential for the sub-division of the garden is not a matter before me. Its use could also be tied to the main dwelling by way of the imposition of a planning condition, if I was minded to allow the appeal. Where its design and scale relate to character and appearance, I have dealt with this matter earlier in my decision
16. I conclude that the proposal would be an incidental use to the main dwelling. Therefore, it would comply in this regard with Policy CS14 (A), as far as this is relevant to incidental use, as well as with the SPD.

Other Matters

17. Whilst I am not unsympathetic as to the rationale for the proposal, this largely relates to personal circumstances and, based on the evidence before me, it would not outweigh the harm to the character and appearance. The amount of remaining usable garden space is not in dispute and attracts neutral weight, as does a lack of both unacceptable impacts as regards the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring properties and objections. In relation to permitted development rights for outbuildings, there is also not the evidence before me that the proposed garage would conform with these rights or of a fallback position, notwithstanding there is already a garage.

Conclusion

18. The harm that would arise to the character and appearance of the building and the area is decisive. For the reasons set out above and having regard to all matters that have been raised, the appeal should be dismissed.

Darren Hendley

INSPECTOR