



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 August 2025

by Graham Wraight BA(Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12 August 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/F4410/W/25/3366646

Land Opposite 59 Great North Road, Woodlands, Doncaster DN6 7NH

- 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 Robyn Patrice Galloway against the decision of City of Doncaster Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/00467/FUL.
 - The development proposed is the change of use of land to domestic curtilage and erection of a detached garage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The description of development given on the application form is extensive, providing an explanation of the need for the proposed development and specific details of its dimensions and the proportion of land it would occupy relative to the dwelling. In the interests of brevity, I have used the description given on the decision notice in the banner header above, as this incorporates the key elements of the proposal and sets out more concisely the development that is proposed.
3. In accordance with the statutory duty set out in Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, I have paid special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the Woodlands Conservation Area (CA).

Main Issues

4. The main issues are the effect of the proposed development upon (i) the character and appearance of the CA and (ii) the provision of open space.

Reasons

Conservation Area

5. The significance of the CA lies in it being a model village, which was built in an arts and crafts style as an innovative housing scheme to serve the mining community. The green spaces, known locally as squares, are an integral part of the area in both an aesthetic sense and in terms of providing recreation space. Whilst it is stated by the appellant that this particular square has not been updated as others have and, in their view, doesn't have the same aesthetics as a result, it nonetheless does make a positive contribution to the immediate area. The partial loss of these areas and the visual changes that arise through the uncoordinated

placing of garages upon them erodes the contribution that they make to the CA, harming the character and appearance of the designated area and its significance.

6. There are other similar garages in the vicinity of the appeal site. Whilst the Council advises that there is no planning record of these, nor do they suggest that they are likely to be removed in the near future. However, those garages themselves do not contribute positively to the character and appearance of the CA, having apparently been added on an individual basis and without any attempt at visual cohesion. Furthermore, on the particular section of green space on which the appeal garage would be located there is only one garage present. As such, this area still retains much of its open feel and potential to be used as open space, notwithstanding that parts of it are clearly used for the parking of cars and there are hardstanding slabs on some areas.
7. Both the loss of an area of open space and the erection of the proposed building would cause harm to the character and appearance of the CA. This would be towards the lower end of less than substantial harm but nonetheless the proposal would not preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the CA. The National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) sets out at paragraph 215 that where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. There are however no public benefits outlined in support of the proposal.
8. For these reasons, the proposed development would fail to accord with Policy 37 and 41 of the Doncaster Local Plan 2021 (LP) where collectively they seek to promote character and local distinctiveness and to safeguard Conservation Areas. It would also fail to accord with the Framework, as the harm caused would not be outweighed by public benefits.

Open space

9. As noted, the function of the green spaces in the vicinity are also to provide communal open space, as individual dwellings have limited external areas around them. The open space of which the appeal site forms part is designated open space as set out in the LP. When considering proposals which result in the loss of such areas, Policy 27 of the LP refers back to the Framework. The requirements set out in that respect include that an assessment has been undertaken which has clearly shown the open space, buildings or land to be surplus to requirements.
10. The appellant considers that the proposal would not entail the loss of open space, as their household has been using the space for parking for over 17 years. However, in the absence of any physical structure on the site, it is not precluded from serving a function as open space, which is the purpose that it is protected in the development plan for. They also make reference to alternative areas of open space in the vicinity and to the current condition of the open space of which the appeal site is part. However, as a whole, I am not satisfied that it has been shown that the land is surplus to requirements as open space or that any of the other criteria set out in Policy 27 of the LP or in the Framework have been met.
11. In conclusion, the proposal would fail to accord with Policy 27 of the LP, where it seeks to protect open space.

Other Matters

12. The appellant highlights the lack of parking that is available to serve the dwellings in the area and that the proposal would provide a better parking arrangement with cover from weather conditions. Whilst I sympathise in these respects in terms of the dwellings not seemingly being built with parking provision, this consideration does not justify the harm that would be caused as a result of the proposed development.
13. It is also stated that they would be willing to erect a different type of garage. However, I must consider what is before me and, in any event, the concerns raised extend beyond just concerns as to the appearance of what is proposed.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons given above, the appeal should be dismissed.

Graham Wraight

INSPECTOR