



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 December 2021

by Claire Megginson

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25th January 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/F4410/D/21/3279649

Bridge House, South Bramwith, DONCASTER, DN7 5SJ

- 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 Martin Warrender against the decision of Doncaster Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 21/00759/FUL, dated 25 February 2021, was refused by notice dated 28 May 2021.
 - The development proposed is alterations and extensions to create recreation room, enlarged kitchen, utility, porch and 3 additional bedrooms, 2 with ensuite.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The decision notice for the application that is the subject of this appeal refers to three separate development plan policies; ENV4 and ENV14 of the Unitary Development Plan (1998) and Policy CS3 of the Doncaster Core Strategy (2012). Subsequent to the submission of this appeal, the Doncaster Local Plan 2015-2035 was adopted in September 2021. This document replaces both the Unitary Development Plan and the Core Strategy and therefore the above policies have been superseded.
3. During the appeal process the Council provided copies of the most relevant policies from the Local Plan (policies 25 and 41) to the appeal and these are considered below. Both parties were given the opportunity to comment further based on this change in the development plan.

Main Issue

4. The effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Reasons

5. The appeal site accommodates a detached brick built dwelling and is located alongside the River Dun Navigation which is separated from the northern boundary of the site by a small public amenity space. The site adjoins a large garden area to a property from Bramwith Lane to the west, a densely overgrown piece of land to the south, and Low Lane to the east where the property takes its access. Across Low Lane are a group of agricultural buildings, some of which are partly collapsed.

6. Beyond the river to the north is an open, flat area of agricultural land, which gives the immediate area an intrinsically rural character.
7. Whilst the appeal site is part of the village of South Bramwith and could not be said to be isolated, it stands alone in a prominent location at the river crossing and is highly visible from the north including from Low Lane and the River Dun Navigation.
8. The design of the appeal property has been altered over the years, with a long single storey annex extension on the east elevation, and a conservatory on the west elevation which has recently been demolished. The red brick and red roof materials on the appeal property can be seen on other buildings in the surrounding area.
9. The appeal scheme would extend the building considerably, adding to the height and mass of the property. Whilst dwellings in the settlement do vary in size and scale, the proposed development includes a significant increase in floorspace, well beyond the 40% outlined in Local Plan Policy 25 (a more stringent figure than the 50% outlined in the Council's Development Guidance and Requirements Supplementary Planning Guidance 2015). The proposed increase in floorspace from an original 93 square metres to 226 square metres cannot be described as limited.
10. The increase from single storey to two storeys adjacent to the road and the increase in the overall roof height of 2.13 metres, coupled with a proposed rendered finish would result in the proposed dwelling being prominent, particularly when viewed from the north. Whilst reasonably localised in its extent, the effect of the scheme would be to diminish unacceptably the character of the host building with consequent harm to the character and appearance of the surrounding rural area.
11. I note that the appellant states that the existing dwelling is in poor condition and that the extensive range of options under permitted development rights should be considered when considering the percentage level of additions that could be made to the property. However, I have very limited information on what permitted development rights are referred to in this case; moreover in any event I consider that the existing condition of the property or potential additions which may be made under permitted development powers do not justify the harm that the proposal would cause in this instance.
12. I therefore conclude that the appeal scheme would have a detrimental effect on the character and appearance of the countryside and would thereby run contrary to the objectives of Local Plan Policies 41 and 25, which seek to limit the scale of extensions to dwellings in the countryside policy area, and to respect and enhance character and local distinctiveness through high quality design. The proposal would also be contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework, which states in paragraph 130 that planning decisions should ensure that developments will add to the overall quality of the area and are sympathetic to local character.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above, having considered the development plan as a whole and all other relevant matters, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

C. Megginson

INSPECTOR