



---

# Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 June 2024

**by Mark Caine BSc (Hons) MTPL MRTPI LSRA**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 1 July 2024**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/F4410/W/23/3334279**

**65 Station Road, Hatfield, Doncaster DN7 6QN**

- 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 Dantom Homes Developments Ltd against the decision of City of Doncaster Council.
  - The application Ref is 22/01376/FUL.
  - The development proposed is the erection of two, four-bedroom dwellings.
- 

## Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

## Preliminary Matter

2. Amended plans have been submitted with the appeal, which show the proposed dwellings and their associated car parking bays to be sited parallel and in line with each other. I have been informed that this is what was originally proposed and consulted upon but amended prior to the Planning Committee Meeting. I have no reason to question this. These changes are minor alterations to the original scheme, and I do not consider that any party would be unfairly prejudiced by my determining of the appeal with regard to the amended drawing refs: 3749-02J and 3749-03B.

## Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

## Reasons

4. The appeal relates to the rear garden of 65 Station Road, a 2-storey detached house. The surrounding area is predominantly residential comprising properties of varied age, style and design. Whilst other backland development exists in the locality, the prevailing character of Station Road is of large, detached dwellings that sit within relatively spacious plots.
5. The materials to be used on the proposed dwellings would not appear conspicuous in relation to those found on the diverse range of neighbouring properties. The reduced ridge heights of the proposed houses in comparison to that of No 65 are also noted. However, by effectively subdividing No 65's rear garden and introducing 2 dwellings into this open, undeveloped area, the proposal would increase the built form and density of development across the site and would significantly reduce this space. The proposed dwellings would also have considerably narrower and smaller footprints and occupy smaller

plots than the majority of other existing nearby dwellings on Station Road. As such, they would inevitably have considerably less space around them and smaller garden areas than are typical for the locality.

6. Whilst the proposal has been designed to take account of an adopted drain to the west of the site, this would result in the proposed dwellings being sited in proximity to each other. In light of all of the factors above, they would appear as closely packed and cramped forms of development that would be out of context with the prevailing pattern of development and the spacious layout of the immediate surroundings.
7. Although its backland location, and existing vegetation along No 65's frontage would limit some views into the site from the public domain, the discordant effect of the proposed development would be clearly visible from the first-floor windows of No 65 and other neighbouring properties.
8. I have been referred to examples and planning permissions for other backland developments in the vicinity. However, the plots of these examples are wider than those proposed with larger dwellings located on them, and I do not know the circumstances or the policies that applied at the time of their consideration. On the evidence presented I therefore cannot be certain that they represent a direct parallel to the proposal.
9. As such, I find that the proposed development would cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the area. It would thereby conflict with Policies 10, 41 and 44 of the Doncaster Local Plan 2015-2035 (2021) (Local Plan). These seek, amongst other things, imaginative design that respects and enhances the character of the locality having regard to design objectives of layout, density, siting, and spacing.

### **Other Matters**

10. The appeal site is located within a Residential Policy Area as defined by the Local Plan Policies Map. The Council has not found the principle of residential development to be objectionable, nor raised any concerns regarding car parking, highway safety, drainage, flood risk, open space, ecology and the living conditions of neighbours and future occupiers. I have also been made aware that it would satisfy the Government's nationally described internal space standards and the Council's design guidance in respect of the amount of private outdoor amenity space. However, these issues did not appear to be contentious in the appeal and the absence of harm in these respects does not add any positive weight in favour of the proposal.
11. It has been put forward that the proposal has been designed to be easily adaptable and accessible for people with disabilities and that it would provide good sized family housing, adding to the diverse range of properties, and create a more diverse, vibrant community. The location of the appeal site relative to public transport and access to local facilities and services, along with the energy efficiency measures are also noted. However, given that the proposal would only be for 2 dwellings any benefits in these respects do not weigh significantly in favour of the proposal.
12. Furthermore, the overgrown appearance of the site and expense of maintenance does not in itself justify the grant of permission for an otherwise unacceptable proposal. The matters above do therefore not overcome or

outweigh the harm that I have identified would be caused to the character and appearance of the area.

**Conclusion**

13. For the reasons given above, having taken account of the development plan as a whole, along with all other relevant material considerations, the appeal should therefore be dismissed.

*Mark Caine*

INSPECTOR