
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 September 2022

by Gary Deane BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 8 March 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/F4410/D/22/3300889

35 Cromwell Drive, Sprotbrough, Doncaster DN5 8DF

- 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 R Pell against the decision of Doncaster Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 22/00467/FUL, dated 22 February 2022, was refused by notice dated 13 April 2022.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a single storey rear extension and 2-storey extension to the side and front.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural matters

2. The proposed development is under construction. The constructed part of the appeal scheme appears to be broadly in accordance with the plans.
3. Since refusing planning permission, the Council has revoked the Developer Guidance and Requirements Supplementary Planning Document (SPD), to which the evidence refers. It has also published Transitional Developer Guidance (TDG), which has replaced the SPD. The appellant has submitted comments on these changes, which I have taken into account. As the TDG has not been adopted, I attach limited weight to it.

Main issue

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

Reasons

5. The appeal property is a 2-storey semi-detached dwelling with a ground floor side projection within an estate style residential area. It stands within a row of semi-detached pairs that are generally separated by good sized gaps and follow a broadly consistent front build line. In the wider area, I observed that dwellings vary in size, type, and general appearance, partly due to various alterations and extensions that have taken place. Consequently, there is some variety to the existing built form in the local area to which No 35 belongs.
6. When seen from Cromwell Drive, the new 2-storey front extension with a hipped end facing the road would be a new and significant feature. By stepping noticeably forward of the main front wall, the new addition would be a

prominent feature in the new front façade. It would also interrupt the established layout of existing development along the same side of this section of road. The proposed side addition would also include a sizeable 2-storey element that would, in effect, elongate the main house to fill almost the entire width of the plot. Due to their scale, design and position, the new front and side extensions, in combination, would overwhelm the simple form, modest proportions and style of the existing dwelling.

7. In views from Cromwell Drive, the front elevation of the finished house would appear significantly wider and larger than its attached counterpart, which has not been extended at the side. Consequently, the new built form would unbalance the principal elevations of this pair to the extent that the imbalance would draw the eye from the road. By introducing a new 2-storey flank wall close to and along part of the site's side boundary, the proposal would also unduly erode the space at the side of the site. This arrangement would create a noticeably smaller gap between the completed building and the adjacent pair and an uncharacteristically abrupt transition between adjacent. The extensive use of render, as proposed, would also be a discordant feature within a residential estate of predominantly brick buildings.
8. For all these reasons, the scale, design, position, and appearance of the proposed front and side extensions would spoil the intrinsic character of the appeal dwelling and be incongruous in the local street scene. By unduly disrupting the established pattern of existing development along this section of Cromwell Drive, the proposed development would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the local area.
9. I saw that some properties in the local area include sizeable front and side extensions and others have rendered walls including those to which the appellant has referred. Background details have also been provided in relation to the Council's recent decision to grant planning permission to enlarge and alter 13 Cromwell Drive with an off-white render applied to that dwelling.
10. I agree that some of the elements proposed are evident elsewhere in the area surrounding the site. However, none of the examples cited or that I saw were very similar in scale and design to the proposal, in its entirety, nor did they have the same relationship to neighbouring buildings as No 35. For instance, No 13 is sited at an offset angle to the road on a corner plot in a different street scene to that of No 35. While the Council has approved the application of render in relation to No 13, that finish sets the appearance of the building apart from those around it, which are largely of brick construction. In other words, it exemplifies the harm to which I have referred.
11. In any event, a key principle of the planning system is that each development should be assessed on its own merits. Having done so, my own conclusion is that the combination of the proposed extensions and alterations would result in a radical change to the scale and appearance of the appeal dwelling with an impact on the street scene that would be both substantial and harmful.
12. On the main issue, I therefore conclude that the proposed development would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the host building and the local area. It therefore conflicts with Policies 41 and 44 of the Doncaster Local Plan 2015-2035 and Policy S1 of the Sprotbrough Neighbourhood Development Plan. These policies aim to ensure that development is of high-quality design and responds positively to the context

and character of the area. It is also at odds with the National Planning Policy Framework, which states that development should be sympathetic to local character and add to the overall quality of the area.

13. The Council appears to raise no objection to the new rear extension. From the submitted plans, I, too, find this part of the appeal scheme acceptable subject to the use of appropriate external materials. However, it is not clearly severable from the proposed 2-storey side extension, which is objectionable. Consequently, I am unable to issue a split decision that grants planning permission solely for it.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons set out above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Gary Deane

INSPECTOR