



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 September 2023

by Sarah Colebourne MA, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 28th September 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/F4410/D/23/3324899

Alexandra House Whiphill Lane, Doncaster, DN3 3JP

- 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 A Hutton against the decision of City of Doncaster Council.
 - The application Ref 23/00302/FUL, dated 14 February 2023, was refused by notice dated 5 April 2023.
 - The development proposed is described as 'Raising of roof to form room in roof. First floor side extension'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural matter

2. The Council described the proposal in its decision as 'An increase in roof height to form rooms in the roof space. Installation of dormer windows and a roof light and erection of a first floor level side extension.' As this describes the proposal in more detail, I have considered the appeal on this basis.

Reasons

3. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the dwelling and the area. The development plan includes policies 41 and 44 in the Doncaster Local Plan (2021) (LP) which together say that proposals will be supported where they respond positively to their context, integrate visually with the surrounding area and that scale, massing and form should be sympathetic to the character of the area and the property.
4. Alexandra House lies within a suburban residential area. It is a modern dwelling on a corner site with its main elevation facing onto Whiphill Lane (a side road) and a side elevation facing onto Nutwell Lane, a main route through Armthorpe. It is a two storey detached house with a shallow, hipped roof and has a 'cottage style' character. This part of Nutwell Lane comprises mainly traditional, two storey, semi-detached houses of a uniform design with hipped roofs. Alexandra House sits very close to the neighbouring house on that road but as it has the same building line and a similar ridge height and roof form, it sits comfortably in that street scene.
5. On this side of Whiphill Lane, dwellings are generally large and detached, set further apart with a variety of designs mostly with pitched apex roofs, some of which are steeply pitched with a high ridge height and rooms within the roof.

The appeal site is separated from the nearest dwelling on that road by its side garden and an adjoining cul-de-sac at Harden Mews of three storey dwellings. In contrast, on the opposite side of Whiphill Lane is a row of semi-detached bungalows.

6. The proposal would alter the existing hipped roof form to a steeply pitched apex roof with an increased ridge height of 0.75m to accommodate a bedroom with ensuite bathroom at second floor level, two dormer windows in the main elevation facing Whiphill Lane and a single dormer in the rear elevation. An existing single storey side element would be extended to create an additional bedroom at first floor level and this would have a matching pitched roof with a lower ridge height.
7. If the proposed roof form and height were acceptable, I am satisfied that the proposed dormers would not be an incongruous feature as these are characteristic of a 'cottage style' dwelling and also present on other dwellings in Harden Mews and in Whiphill Lane. Moreover, they are small in size and scale and not overly dominant.
8. I accept that the resulting dwelling would not be dissimilar to some of those seen further along this side of Whiphill Lane and that a corner position can sometimes provide the opportunity for some variety in form and height, providing a focal point in the street as in the examples referred to by the appellant.
9. However, this site differs from those examples and from other dwellings in Whiphill Lane because in this case, when seen in both the approach along Whiphill Lane towards Nutwell Lane and from Nutwell Lane itself, the appeal dwelling would be viewed in the same context as the adjacent semi-detached house. Given the very close proximity of the two dwellings, their contrasting roof forms, the difference in the resulting ridge heights and the additional bulk and massing proposed, the proposal would result in the dwellings having an unduly cramped relationship in the street scene. As the appeal site has a prominent location, this would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the proposed development would be contrary to the development plan policies referred to earlier and there are no material considerations that would outweigh this. The appeal should be dismissed.

Sarah Colebourne

Inspector