



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 May 2025

by **C Skelly BA (Hons) MSc MA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22nd August 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/F4410/W/25/3361626

Woodside, Doncaster Road, Conisbrough, Doncaster, DN12 3AR

- 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 Teresa Mitchell-Davies against the decision of City of Doncaster Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/01509/FUL.
 - The development proposed is demolition of existing garage to be replaced with a single storey side extension extended to the front line of the house, extension to be used as a Carpet Shop.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. As part of the appeal the appellant has sought to amend the scheme to address the reasons for the refusal. This would involve re-purposing the existing garage structure with no additional development. However, in response to the Council's appeal statement this request has been withdrawn. Consequently, I have dealt with the appeal on the same basis to which the Council reached their decision.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are:
 - whether the proposal is inappropriate development in the Green Belt having regard to the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) and any relevant development plan policies; and
 - the effect of the proposal on the vitality and viability of the existing network of town, district and local centres.

Reasons

Whether inappropriate development

4. The appeal site is located within the Green Belt. In this regard Policy 1 of the Doncaster Local Plan (2021) (LP) states that the openness and permanence of Doncaster's Green Belt will be preserved and defers to national policy for development proposals within the Green Belt.
5. The appeal site comprises a two-storey detached dwelling, which has been extended by a two-storey side extension and fronts onto Doncaster Road. Whilst it is located within a small stretch of development, this group of buildings are physically separated from nearby settlements by countryside. The dwelling has

large gardens to the front and rear, beyond which is Nearcliff Wood. To the side of the dwelling there is a detached garage and an area of hardstanding which runs along the side of the house.

6. Paragraph 154 of the Framework states that development in the Green Belt is inappropriate unless one of the listed exceptions apply. A previous appeal¹ for a similar scheme on this site was dismissed in July 2024. The Inspector for this appeal considered that the proposed extension amounted to disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building. Accordingly, the Inspector concluded that the proposed development would not satisfy exception c) or any other exceptions stated in paragraph 154 of the Framework. The current appeal is also considered by the Council to constitute inappropriate development as it would result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building and I agree with this position.
7. Since this appeal there have been changes to the Framework with regards to the definition of Previously Developed Land (PDL). A further exception to development in the Green Belt at Paragraph 154 g) of the Framework is the limited infilling or the partial or complete redevelopment of PDL (which would not cause substantial harm to the openness of the Green Belt).
8. The existing domestic garage would be demolished to make way for the proposed carpet shop which would align with the front elevation of the host dwelling and would have an overall footprint of 50sqm. To the front of the existing garage running along the side of the dwelling is an area of hard standing. The area where the proposed carpet shop would be sited therefore comprises PDL.
9. The proposed development would be located to the front of the adjoining commercial garage workshop building. This workshop sits next to a large car sales building, both of which have higher ridge heights than the existing domestic garage. The arrangement and height of the existing buildings provides visual enclosure of the site from the countryside to the rear. The proposed extension would therefore be seen against the backdrop of the two-storey dwelling and the workshop building and would be largely surrounded by existing built development. It would therefore comprise limited infilling of PDL which would not cause substantial harm to the openness of the Green Belt.
10. For the above reasons, I consider that the proposal would comprise the limited infilling of PDL which would not cause substantial harm to the openness of the Green Belt. Consequently, the proposed development would not be inappropriate development under paragraph 154 g).
11. In conclusion, the proposal would not be inappropriate development in the Green Belt and therefore would not conflict with Policy 1 of the LP or guidance in the Framework relating to Green Belts.

Vitality and Viability

12. Policy 22 states that Main Town Centre Uses, including retail will need to be located according to the 'Network of Centres' defined in Policies 1 and 2, which includes Neighbourhood Shopping Parades (NSPs) (small clusters or groups of shops and services within existing residential areas). The sequential approach is set out in

¹ APP/F4410/W/24/3337266

Policy 22, which states that proposals for Main Town Centre Uses on the edge of, or outside of designated centres will only be permitted where it can be demonstrated that sites within, and then on the edge of town, district and local centres have been assessed and it can be demonstrated that they are not available (or expected to become available within a reasonable period) suitable, or viable for the proposed development. Although NSPs are included in Table 2 beneath Policy 1 and identified on the Policies Map, there is no requirement in the Local Plan that they are subject to the Sequential Test.

13. It is recognised by the Council that carpet shops of the nature of that proposed are often located within town centres as it provides the benefit of increased footfall and maintains their vitality. As part of the planning application a Retail Statement and Sequential Test² was submitted. This was a district wide search which considered available properties in Doncaster and its district and local town centres. In response to a request from the Council's Town and Retail Officer a more thorough search of nearby local centres where premises potentially were available was undertaken and submitted as an addendum³ to the sequential test.
14. Although the Retail Statement and Sequential Tests have considered sites in the locations set out in Part 1 of Policy 22, premises have been discounted by the appellant in town or local centres on the basis of practicality and parking. Limited information has been provided as to why on-site car parking would be required for the transportation of rugs and smaller cuts and why available nearby car parking would not be suitable.
15. Whilst I am sympathetic to the personal circumstances of the appellant and recognise that the proposal provides a suitable option to continue working, no substantive evidence has been put forward as to why appropriate, accessible sequentially preferable locations would not be equally suitable. I therefore am not satisfied that there are no suitable sequentially preferable locations as required by Policy 22 of the LP.
16. I note that the appeal site has good access to nearby settlements by car and bus, and that it would provide sufficient space for customer parking and deliveries. I also recognise that the co-location with the dwelling would provide security surveillance of the carpet shop. However, these benefits are not sufficient to outweigh the harm to the vitality and viability of the existing network of town, district, local centres and NSPs.
17. The proposal would harm the vitality and viability of the existing network of town, district and local centres. It thereby conflicts with Policy 22 of the LP, which seeks amongst other things to ensure a sequential approach is taken for main town centre uses.

Conclusion

18. The proposal conflicts with the development plan and the material considerations do not indicate that the appeal should be decided other than in accordance with it. For the reasons given above the appeal should be dismissed.

C Skelly INSPECTOR

² MAW Town Planning LTD, dated 28th July 2024

³ MAW Town Planning Additional Information by email dated 8th November 2024