



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 June 2025

by N Kempton BAHons PGDip MA IHBC MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19 June 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/F4410/W/24/3355017

16 Halifax Avenue, Conisbrough, Doncaster DN12 3PP

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant outline planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Miss Enya Booth against the decision of Doncaster Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/01352/OUT.
 - The development proposed is 2No dwellings to land between 16 & 18 Halifax Avenue.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The planning application was for outline planning permission with all matters reserved. The appellant's appeal statement confirms that the submitted elevations and site plan are for illustrative purposes only. I have determined the appeal on this basis.

Main Issues

3. The main issues relevant to this appeal are the effect of the proposed development on:
 - the character and appearance of the area;
 - the living conditions of the occupiers of no. 16 and 18 Halifax Avenue with particular regard to noise and disturbance;
 - the safe and efficient operation of the highway in the vicinity of the site.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. Situated in a predominantly residential area, the appeal site is bordered on three sides by housing and gardens. The appeal site is located at the end of Halifax Avenue, which is a compact cul-de-sac comprising early to mid-twentieth century semi-detached and terraced two storey, red brick housing, beyond which is Conisbrough Cliffs to the north.
5. The layout is characterised by a uniform pattern of development with houses arranged in a tight linear form flanking the length of Halifax Avenue, with a pair of semi's positioned at the head of the cul-de-sac, which terminates in a circular

formation. The appeal site is presently residential curtilage in between no.16 and 18 Halifax Avenue.

6. The indicative plans show a pair of semi-detached dwellings on the appeal site. This reflects the house type evident in Halifax Avenue. Notwithstanding this, the indicative site layout of the proposed development would represent a departure from the established spatial pattern of development. Whilst the proposal may achieve the required separation distances, the alignment and siting of these semi's, in garden space to the rear, would create an imbalance in the street scene, eroding the uniformity in the pattern and grain of development, thereby failing to reflect local distinctiveness.
7. For these reasons, I conclude that the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the area. Consequently, the proposed development would be contrary to Policy 41 of the Doncaster Local Plan (LP) which relates to character and local distinctiveness and supports development proposals where they, amongst other things, integrate visually and functionally with the immediate and surrounding area at a settlement, neighbourhood, street and plot scale.

Living Conditions

8. The proposed pair of semi-detached dwellings would be served by an access which would pass between no.16 and 18. The principal entrance doors to these existing properties are positioned on the side wall of the houses respectively, directly facing and immediately adjacent to the access. Furthermore, the access would be in close proximity to their principal windows.
9. The appellant acknowledges that the narrow access would be a 'pinch point' but contests that the amount of traffic using the private drive would not have any impact upon the day to day living of the existing and proposed residents. Additional activity and vehicle movements would be generated by the occupiers of the proposed dwellings. Given the constraints of the site frontage, the very narrow access and the proximity to the existing dwellings, intensification of the use of the access would generate noise and disturbance, to the detriment of the living conditions of the occupants of the neighbouring dwellings.
10. The appellant contests that as the owner of the land also owns the existing dwellings, sound reduction measures could be provided to these dwellings. However, no details of such measures are provided, and it is unclear how the noise arising from the proposed development could be mitigated by the provision of these measures.
11. As such, the proposed development would be detrimental to the living conditions of the occupiers of no.16 and 18 Halifax Avenue with particular regard to noise and disturbance, contrary to the following policies of the LP: Policy 10 which states that new residential development will be supported provided the development would, amongst other things, provide for an acceptable level of residential amenity for both new and existing residents; Policy 44 A) which states that developments must protect existing amenity and not significantly impact on the living conditions or privacy of neighbours or the host property.
12. Furthermore, the proposal is also contrary to paragraph 135(f) of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), which states that development should create a high standard of amenity for existing and future users.

Highway Safety

13. With regards to matters of highway safety, specifically concerning the proposed access arrangements and whether they can be realistically implemented, these matters would be addressed at reserved matters stage.
14. However, the indicative site layout plan shows that the proposed development would be accessed via the existing driveway, leading to a very narrow gap between no. 16 and 18, the intersection of the two gardens. The access would serve the two existing dwellings and the two proposed dwellings.
15. The Council's Highway Officer concluded that the access does not meet the dimensions set out in the South Yorkshire Residential Design Guide (SYRDG). Whilst only guidance, the proposed access would not allow two cars to pass each other within the curtilage so as not to cause an obstruction in the highway. Notwithstanding that the access widens beyond the identified 'pinch point', given the constraints of the site frontage, the very narrow access and the proximity to the existing dwellings, it would not be possible to achieve the necessary width of a safe access.
16. As such, I conclude that the proposed development would have an adverse impact on the safe and efficient operation of the highway in the vicinity of the site. Therefore, the proposed development would fail to accord with Policy 44 B) of the LP, which supports housing proposals where they meet a number of key design objectives, including: 8) access points, parking and operational highway requirements are safe and complement the character of the existing street scene and highway functions.

Other Matters

17. The construction of two dwellings on the site would contribute to the area's housing stock- thereby aligning with the national aim, as set out in the Framework, to boost significantly the supply of homes. However, two dwellings would only make a very modest contribution and therefore be of only limited benefit, even if there were a housing shortfall (and this has not been demonstrated). This would not be sufficient to weigh in favour of the proposal to offset the identified harms.

Planning Balance and Conclusion

18. I have found that the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the area. It would provide inadequate living conditions for the occupants of no. 16 and 18 Halifax Avenue, with particular regard to noise and disturbance. It would have an adverse impact on the safe and efficient operation of the highway in the vicinity of the site
19. I acknowledge that the proposed development would provide two additional dwellings: an important consideration in the context of the Government's objective to boost significantly the supply of homes. However, Doncaster Metropolitan Borough Council can demonstrate a 5-year housing land supply. Nonetheless, these benefits would not outweigh the identified harm.
20. For the reasons given above, the development is contrary to the relevant policies of the development plan when read as a whole and there are no material considerations to indicate that a decision should be taken other than in accordance with that plan.

21. The appeal is dismissed.

N Kempton

INSPECTOR