



Appeal Decision

Site visit carried out on 10 April 2025

by **Jennifer Vyse DipTP MRTPI DipPBM**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 24 April 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/F4410/D/25/3358864

12 Willow Street, Conisbrough, Doncaster DN12 3AD

- 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 the Executor of Marjorie Reynolds against the decision of Doncaster Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application No is 24/01041/FUL.
 - The development proposed comprises the installation of squared bay windows and canopy to front and creation of paved area to the front.
-

Decision

1. For the reasons that follow, the appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this case relates to whether the development proposed would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of Conisbrough Conservation Area.

Reasons for the Decision

3. Whilst the Conservation Area is dominated by the Castle and Church, it includes several 17th and 18th Century properties, as well as numerous buildings from the Victorian period, mainly in the form of commercial terraces and industrial terraced housing. Willow Street, a residential cul-de-sac, is lined by one such terrace, with No 12 sited at its northern end.
4. The heritage significance of the Conservation Area derives in part from the legibility of its history, including the tight-knit, 19th Century red brick residential terraces. Notwithstanding alterations to some of the Willow Street properties, including No 12, I saw that the traditional form and materials of the terrace give it an architectural unity and coherence that makes a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and its significance.
5. The original window openings at No 12 have been altered – they have been widened and reduced in height, including removal of the original lintols and cills, although the central entrance door appears to occupy the original opening. At ground floor, the two, shallow, ‘threepenny bit’ bow windows, project only marginally from the front wall. They are flat-topped. It is proposed to replace them with rectangular bow windows, projecting slightly further out than the existing windows, with each supported on brackets. In addition, a pitched roof canopy is proposed on the frontage, extending across both windows and the entrance door.

6. Whilst the existing altered windows, and poorly modified brickwork, have eroded the original character of the building to some degree, it still retains its relatively plain frontage, a unifying feature of the terrace. The addition of the more substantial squared bow windows, and the canopy above, would introduce significant projections to the frontage, which would be seen at jarring odds with the historic plain façade of the terrace. As a consequence, the development would harm the heritage significance of the Conservation Area, failing to preserve or enhance its character and appearance.
7. I saw that No 9 has a small lean-to roof above the front door, but that is a visually lightweight structure that does not extend across the windows to either side and does not set any kind of a precedent for the development proposed. I am also mindful that the window alterations that have been carried out to No 10 at some time in the past, are similar to the existing fenestration at No 12. Again, however, that does not provide any support for the more intrusive development currently proposed. The harm that I have identified brings the development into conflict with policies 37 and 41 of the Doncaster Local Plan (September 2021), which together and among other things seek to conserve heritage assets, with new development being required to make a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness.
8. The development proposed also includes the block paving of an area in front of No 12, to provide parking for up to three vehicles. A large tree is located in what would be the middle of the parking area, with another located immediately adjacent the site to the north, the root plate to which is likely to extend beneath the proposed paving.¹ Both trees currently make a positive contribution to the established character and appearance of the Conservation Area. The site also contains a length of overgrown hedgerow which also contributes to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area, although not to the same extent as the trees.
9. No tree survey was submitted with the application, as required by policy 32 of the Local Plan. Moreover, the submitted plans do not show retention of the tree within the site, or the hedgerow. Whilst I take no issue with removal of the hedge, were the tree to be felled in order to facilitate construction of the paved area, there would be consequent harm to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area, which would not be preserved. Furthermore, it is likely that the root plate to the adjacent tree extends into the appeal site, beneath the area of proposed paving. There is no information in this regard, to any measures for its protection. Were there to be harm to the adjacent tree as a consequence of the development proposed, again there would be harm to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. There would be conflict in these regards, with policy 32 of the Local Plan, which requires that it be demonstrated that trees and hedgerows have been adequately considered during the design process, so that a significant adverse impact on public amenity can be avoided.
10. Whilst the harms that I have identified would, in the language of the Planning Policy Framework, be less than substantial, there would still be real and serious harm, a consideration which paragraph 212 of the Framework indicates should be given significant weight. Paragraph 215 of the Framework indicates that such harm should be weighed against the public benefits of a proposal. It is suggested, in this regard, that the development would mask some of the poorly executed brickwork

¹ The adjacent tree is part of a Woodland Area which is covered by a Tree Preservation Order.

on the building frontage, referred to above. Whatever the shortcomings of the altered brickwork, its impact on the homogeneous character and appearance of the terrace is not so great as to justify the significantly more intrusive form of development now proposed. In this case, therefore, I find no public benefits that would outweigh the harms that I have identified that would be a consequence of the appeal scheme. Therefore, for the reasons set out above, I conclude, on balance, that the appeal should not succeed.

Jennifer A Vyse
INSPECTOR