



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 June 2021 by Darren Ellis MPlan

Decision by Chris Preston BA (Hons) BPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 29 September 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/F4410/D/21/3270940

99 Meadowfield Road, Barnby Dun, Doncaster, DN3 1LS

- 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 Ian Casey against the decision of Doncaster Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 20/03371/FUL, dated 4 December 2020, was refused by notice dated 24 February 2021.
 - The development proposed is a front boundary wall.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Procedural Matters

3. The wall that is the subject of this appeal has already been constructed. I have dealt with the appeal on that basis.
4. The Government published on 20 July 2021 a revised version of the National Planning Policy Framework. Accordingly, and in light of the reference made to the previous iteration of the Framework within the submitted evidence, the parties have been provided with a further opportunity to make submissions in respect of the publication. Any comments which have been received have been taken into account in the appeal decision.

Main Issue

5. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the street scene.

Reasons for the Recommendation

6. The appeal site comprises a detached dwelling on Meadowfield Road. The street is part of a 1980's housing estate that consists of detached dwellings that are set back from the highway with front gardens and driveways to the front or side of the dwelling. Condition 10 of the original planning permission for the
-

estate¹ removed the permitted development right for the erection of walls, fences or other mean of enclosure to be erected between the walls of a dwelling that fronts the highway and the highway boundary itself. This condition was imposed to ensure that such matters can be the subject of further consideration by the Local Planning Authority in the interests of amenity.

7. Meadowfield Road is the key thoroughfare through the estate and the sweeping nature of the road, allied to the generally open front gardens enables the original open plan ethos to be appreciated. Most of the front gardens have no physical boundary at all, while some have low hedges and vegetation as a boundary treatment. There are a few properties with taller fences that are adjacent to the highway, however these enclose the rear gardens of these properties. Overall, the estate has an open, green and pleasant character and the generally open front gardens are integral to that.
8. The wall projects along most of the front boundary and also partially divides the front garden from the driveway. The wall is constructed of red brick with five piers and black metal railings in between the piers. Although the railings are lightweight in appearance, the brick wall and piers are not sympathetic to the existing boundary treatments in the street and introduce a hard built form up to the edge of the pavement. If viewed in isolation, the wall is well constructed with attractive detailing in the coursing. However, when viewed in the context of the open plan nature of the estate, the hard built form appears incongruous and detracts from the carefully planned open character of the street scene.
9. As noted above, a few properties have fences along the shared boundary between two properties, however these fences do not project along the front boundary or enclose the front garden area. Several properties have low hedges or vegetation as front boundary treatments, however these have a much softer appearance than a brick wall and maintain the green and open character and appearance of the street.
10. The bungalow at 56 Hatfield Lane, at the junction of Meadowfield Road and Hatfield Lane, has a brick wall that fronts the highway. No details of any planning permission for this wall have been submitted. This wall is slightly taller than the wall at the appeal property and is constructed wholly of bricks. However, No 56 is a corner plot on the edge of the estate and as such has slightly less of an impact on the character and appearance of the estate compared to the appeal property which is further into the estate and has dwellings on both sides. In any case, the wall at No 56 is an anomaly in the street scene and its presence does not justify the proposal before me.
11. For the reasons given above, the wall causes significant harm to the character and appearance of the street scene. The proposal therefore conflicts with saved policy ENV54 of the of the Doncaster Unitary Development Plan (July 1998), policy CS14 of the Core Strategy (May 2012) and the guidance in paragraph (a) of section 2.12 of the Development Guidance and Requirements: Supplementary Planning Document (July 2015). These all seek for development to be sympathetic to the character of the area and to integrate well with the immediate and surrounding environment.

¹ Planning application ref. 85/0168/P

12. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

Darren Ellis

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

13. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and, on that basis, agree with the recommendation and shall dismiss the appeal.

Chris Preston

INSPECTOR