
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 October 2020

by K A Taylor MSC URP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 08 December 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/F4410/W/20/3257038

37 Allenby Crescent, New Rossington, Doncaster DN11 0JX

- 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 Mike Hollick, Footprint Properties Ltd against the decision of Doncaster Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 20/00516/FUL, dated 20 February 2020, was refused by notice dated 31 March 2020.
 - The development proposed is to demolish the existing an existing porch and to erect 2no. 3 bedroom semi-detached dwellings over two storeys.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Issues

2. Within the evidence I have been referred to the emerging Doncaster Local Plan 2015-2035 Publication Version, however given the stage of plan preparation and the level of unknown objections, I have afforded this limited weight.
3. I have also had regard, and in accordance with Paragraph 30 of the National Planning Policy Framework, 2019 (the Framework) in this appeal decision to the Rossington Parish Council, Rossington-Draft Neighbourhood Plan 2016-2032, which the Council have provided in their evidence. However, this is not at an advance stage and I have therefore afforded this minimal weight.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

5. The appeal site is garden land to the side of No.37 Allenby Crescent, which is a two storey end terraced dwelling with a spacious side and rear garden areas, positioned on a prominent corner of crossroads. It is located within a predominantly residential area, forming part of a wider estate that has a distinct street pattern and rigid approach to its layout.
6. The majority of dwellings in the immediate vicinity to the appeal site being terraced or semi-detached at two storeys, sharing similar features and characteristics including large gaps of unbuilt development between garden areas and dwellings that are situated along corner plots of the crossroads. Despite some variation in form, the dwellings and the spaciousness of plots in

the area appreciable contribute to the character and appearance of the street scene.

7. The proposed dwellings would be positioned centrally but extend almost the entire width of the site. Thus, the restrictive plot size and proposed layout would result in the dwellings being of a contrived nature within the site itself, reducing the spaciousness and appearing cramped and discordant dwellings being out of character with the distinct pattern and visual appearance of development within the area.
8. Furthermore, the proposed dwellings would be sited further forward than the majority of existing properties along the adjacent row resulting in an unacceptable form of prominent built development on the corner/crossroads. It would therefore result in incongruous dwellings having a significant adverse effect on the character and appearance of the immediate street scene and when viewed from along Allenby Crescent.
9. The parties disagree whether the appeal site would form infill development. It is clear from the evidence that the appeal site forms a small gap within an otherwise built up frontage. I would agree with the Council's assessment that in this case *'infill development is the process of developing vacant or under-used parcels within existing urban areas that are already largely developed'*. Furthermore, the example SPD illustration¹ appears to demonstrate plot widths rather than defining what is infill development. Nonetheless, even if I were to agree with the appellant it does not outweigh the harm I have found to the character and appearance of the area.
10. For the reasons given above, I conclude the proposed development would cause harm to the character and appearance of the area. It would be contrary to Policies CS1 and CS14 of the Doncaster Metropolitan Borough Council Core Strategy 2011-2028, 2012 and Saved Policy PH11 of the Doncaster Unitary Development Plan, 1998, Saved 2007. Taken together they require that proposals are place-specific in their design, and must be high quality that contributes to local distinctiveness; only permits development for housing where the form would not be detrimental to the character of the surrounding area.
11. The proposed development would also be contrary to the Framework, Section 12: Achieving well-designed places.

Other Matters

12. I have been referred to other appeal decisions² within the area. However, I have limited details of these cases and so cannot be sure they are directly comparable to the proposals before me. In any event, the appeal is necessarily determined on its individual merits on the basis of the evidence before me.
13. The appellant refers to the Framework and that it is supportive of positive planning and ensuring that land is viable as a resource and is put to best use. Whilst this may be the case, it is not without caveats, including that developments are sympathetic to local character. Moreover, the definition of

¹ Doncaster Council Residential Backland and Infill Development: Supplementary Planning Document (SPD), 2015

² 3207025, 2142727, 2063588

previously developed land³ excludes land in built-up areas including residential gardens, of which the site forms part.

14. I acknowledge the appellants' reference to the Housing White Paper, and Doncaster Council's Housing Needs Study, 2019 re being insufficient mix of housing around the area, whilst this may be the case, I have no substantial evidence to suggest that the proposal would be constructed to meet local housing need, be a self-build or be provided as low-cost housing as the evidence before me suggests the dwellings would be for market housing.
15. Although the proposed development would not cause any harm to the living conditions of neighbouring properties including overshadowing, outlook, privacy and overlooking, and that private garden & space standards would be met, addresses highway safety, flooding, ecology/trees, absence of third party comments, these considerations do not outweigh the harm caused by the development.
16. I recognise the appeal proposal would have benefits with regard to the supply of housing in the Borough, be within a sustainable location and the contribution both construction opportunities and any future occupiers would make to the local economy. This would be limited due to the quantum of development proposed. These matters, however, and any material considerations, do not outweigh my findings in respect of the main issue nor the conflict I have found with the development plan read as a whole.

Conclusion

17. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

KA Taylor

INSPECTOR

³ Annex 2:Glossary