



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 June 2024

by A Berry MTCP (Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26th June 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/F4410/D/24/3341033

11 Sunningdale Road, Wheatley Hills, Doncaster DN2 5LX

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Egidijus Kimbra against the decision of Doncaster Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 23/02551/FUL.
 - The development proposed is the demolition of a single storey rear extension and the construction of a double storey rear extension and loft conversion.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposed development on:
 - a) the character and appearance of the surrounding area; and
 - b) the living conditions of the occupiers of the host dwelling, with particular reference to the size of the rear garden.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

3. The appeal property comprises a two-storey, semi-detached dwelling with a hipped roof sited towards the top of a residential street that is a no-through road, except for providing access to the garages/rear gardens of dwellings fronting Thorne Road and West Grove. Sunningdale Road consists of dwellings with a similar appearance to the appeal property. It is proposed to demolish an existing single storey rear extension, construct a part single storey part two-storey rear extension, alter the roof from a hip to a gable and construct a box dormer on the rear roof slope.
4. The dwelling's position towards the top of a no-through road and the siting of neighbouring properties with narrow gaps between, would ensure that the proposals would not be highly discernible from Sunningdale Road or Armthorpe Road. However, clear views of the proposals would be afforded from Thorne Road and from a car park to the south.
5. The proposed box dormer would occupy most of the resulting rear roof slope and would conflict with the South Yorkshire Residential Design Guide Supplementary Planning Guidance, adopted 2011 (SPG) that requires dormers to not be over-dominant. The hip-to-gable roof alteration would unbalance the

pair of semi-detached dwellings and would be out of character with the other dwellings fronting Sunningdale Road that all have hipped roofs. Also, cumulatively, the proposals would dominate the rear elevation of the original dwelling, resulting in an overdeveloped and significantly altered appearance that would harm the character and appearance of the original dwelling.

6. I have been directed to examples of box dormers and hip-to-gable roof alterations at properties on West Grove that the appellant considers are similar to the appeal proposal. I have also been directed to a flat roofed two-storey extension to the rear of 9 Sunningdale Road that is said to have a larger footprint and is out-of-character with the surrounding area. However, I have limited information regarding the planning history of these examples and therefore it is unclear whether planning permission was obtained or indeed required. Furthermore, none of the examples include a similar combination of extensions/alterations as the appeal proposal. In any event, I must determine each proposal on its own merits.
7. In reference to the first main issue, the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the surrounding area. It would conflict with Policies 41 and 44 of the Doncaster Local Plan 2015-2035, adopted 2021 (LP) which, amongst other things, seek to ensure that the scale, massing and form of proposals are sympathetic to the character of the area or the existing host property, and proposals should be of a high quality design that contributes to local distinctiveness. It would also conflict with paragraph 135 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) that seeks to ensure developments are visually attractive and are sympathetic to local character including the surrounding built environment.

Living Conditions – Garden Size

8. The host dwelling's rear garden falls significantly below the minimum garden size for a dwelling with three or more bedrooms, as stated within the SPG. The proposed extension would have a greater footprint than the extension it would replace and therefore, it would further erode the size of the host dwelling's rear garden. While the appellant asserts that the reduction in the size of the rear garden would be minimal, a reduction of 3.75sqm would be significant for a small garden that does not meet the SPG's minimum garden size.
9. The appellant states that the existing garage could be demolished to increase the size of the rear garden. However, the garage is shown to be retained on the proposed drawings. Furthermore, I am unclear whether the removal of the garage to create a larger rear garden would be acceptable against other development plan policies, such as off-street parking.
10. In reference to the second main issue, the proposal would harm the living conditions of the occupiers of the host dwelling, with particular reference to the size of the rear garden. It would conflict with Policy 44 of the LP which, amongst other things, seeks to ensure there is adequate provision of amenity and garden space. It would also conflict with paragraph 135(f) of the Framework that seeks to ensure that developments create places with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users.

Other Matters

11. The appellant suggests that the proposals would offer improvements to "*living conditions and environmental efficiency without exceeding permitted development right thresholds*". However, these matters have not been substantiated with evidence.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above, having regard to the development plan as a whole and all other material considerations, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

A Berry

INSPECTOR