
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 September 2025 by E Nutman BA (Hons)

Decision by M Russell BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25 November 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/F4410/D/25/3368552

2 Somerton Drive, Bessacarr, Doncaster DN4 6EB

- 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 Mr & Mrs Jopling against the decision of City of Doncaster Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/00540/FUL.
 - The development proposed is single storey extension to front & rear and double storey extension to side.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for a single storey extension to front & rear and double storey extension to side at 2 Somerton Drive, Bessacarr, Doncaster DN4 6EB in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 25/00540/FUL, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Drawing No MS/57/25-02 (Proposed elevations and layouts), Site Plan (1:500) and Location Plan (1:1250).
 - 3) The external materials of the development hereby permitted shall match those used on the existing building.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on highway safety.

Reasons for the Recommendation

Highway Safety

4. 2 Somerton Drive (No 2) is a two-storey, three-bedroomed, semi-detached dwelling. The dwelling is served by an attached garage with a driveway to the front of it. Boundary treatments that are low in height line the front boundary. Vehicles enter and leave the site via a shared access which extends between the driveway and the road. This crosses an area of grass verge at the junction of Somerton Drive with Saint Wilfrid's Road. The public footway lines the perimeter of the grass verge

including alongside the front boundary of the appeal site. On my site visit I observed low levels of vehicular and pedestrian activity in the vicinity of the appeal site, consistent with the residential character of the area.

5. The existing driveway at No 2 does not provide turning space. Even so, the low height of the front boundary treatment allows for good visibility and there is no evidence to suggest that the current arrangement has resulted in any significant conflict between vehicle movements associated with the site and other users of the highway. Moreover, the driveway depth would stay the same. There would also be no meaningful reduction in the width of the driveway given that the proposed porch would only sit alongside a minimal section and would replace planting. Consequently, there would be no material increase in risk for conflict between vehicles entering or exiting the site and pedestrians, cyclists or other vehicles on the highway.
6. The Highway Authority has drawn attention to the parking standards (the standards) for residential development at Appendix 6 of Policy 13 of the Doncaster Local Plan (2021) (LP). As this relates to 'new residential developments', it is unclear whether this applies to extensions to existing dwellings. Even if it does, Policy 13 A) 4. confirms that a departure from the standards may be justified on a case-by-case basis and does not limit the situations where this may be applied. In this particular instance, there is no evidence to suggest that the existing garage should be counted as a parking space noting that the standards indicate this should only be the case if a garage has 3 x 6 metres minimum clear internal dimensions.
7. In addition, one additional bedroom above the existing situation would be unlikely to result in any significant increase in demand for parking. Furthermore, at the time of my visit there were ample opportunities for on street parking, away from the junction but in close proximity to the site. Indeed, there is also no evidence indicating that there are significant levels of parking stress in the area at specific times of the day or issues in terms of the function of the street arising from on street parking. Therefore, I am satisfied that appropriate levels of parking exist to serve the appeal dwelling.
8. I conclude, the proposed development would have an acceptable effect on highway safety. In that regard, it would accord with the requirements in Policies 13, 42, and 44 of the LP for new development to ensure appropriate levels of parking provision are made, that access points and parking safely cater for pedestrians, cyclists and vehicles and that there is sufficient parking so as not to dominate the function of the street. For the same reasons it would also comply with the National Planning Policy Framework which confirms that development should only be prevented or refused on highway grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety.

Other matter

9. There is a suggestion within the evidence that the Highway Authority (HA) has had sight of a drawing showing how two car parking spaces could be achieved within the frontage of the appeal site. From what I have seen the HA raised a concern in respect of that layout. Such a drawing is not before me. In any case, additional parking does not form part of the development description and, given my findings, planning permission is not dependant on additional parking being provided. Therefore, the absence of such a drawing is not a reason to withhold planning permission in this instance.

Conditions

10. In addition to the standard three-year period implementation condition, a condition confirming the approved drawings is necessary in the interests of certainty. In order to protect the character and appearance of the area, it is reasonable to attach a condition requiring the materials to be used in the construction of the extensions to match the existing building.

Conclusion and Recommendation

11. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be allowed.

E Nutman

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

12. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is allowed.

M Russell

INSPECTOR