
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 31 January 2017

by Claire Searson MSc PGDip BSc (Hons) MRTPI IHBC

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 8th February 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/P4415/D/16/3163122

10 Limetree Avenue, Kiveton Park, Rotherham, S26 5NY

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Ms Emma Birks against the decision of Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref RB2016/0975, dated 21 July 2016, was refused by notice dated 15 September 2016.
 - The development proposed is two storey front extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development upon the character and appearance of No 10 Limetree Avenue, its neighbouring terraced properties and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. No 10 Limetree Avenue is a 2-storey dwelling of rendered brick and concrete tiled roof construction. It forms the middle dwelling of a small terraced row of 3 properties. No 8 and No 12 flank the appeal property and have 2 storey projections with hipped roofs to the front elevations, which adds visual interest and symmetry to the whole row.
 4. The wider area comprises of an inter-war social housing estate and I saw that there were a number of rows of 3 terraced blocks with the same design as Nos 8, 10 and 12, particularly along the eastern side of Limetree Avenue. This gives the area a pleasant and uniform character.
 5. The proposed extension would be 2-storey in height with a hipped roof. It would be narrow in width and would be offset to one side of the appeal property creating a small gap between this and No 12.
 6. There is a dispute as to whether the depth of the extension would be in line with the front elevations of Nos 8 and 12, or whether it would extend slightly beyond this. The submitted block plan does appear to indicate this extends further in front of No 12, however this is only very marginal. Regardless of this and while the proposal is designed to mimic the forward projections of the neighbouring dwellings, I consider that the size, proportions and positioning of
-

the proposed extension would be a discordant and jarring addition to No 10 which would unbalance the form, interest and rhythm of the terraced row.

7. Furthermore, the introduction of a front extension would fail to respond to the general pattern of development and would be at odds with the uniform character of other dwellings on the estate. As such it would therefore be an incongruous form of development within the street scene and wider area.
8. Overall I conclude that the proposal would cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling, the wider terrace and the area. As such the proposal is in conflict with Policy CS28 of the Rotherham Local Plan Core Strategy (2014) which seeks to secure well designed development which is responsive to their context and be visually attractive.
9. The development would also fail to accord with the adopted Householder Design Guide Interim Planning Guidance (2014) which requires that front extensions should not harm the character and appearance of the host property or be of a design out of keeping with others in the street. The proposal also conflicts with paragraphs 17 and 56 of the National Planning Policy Framework as it fails to secure high quality design.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons set out above, and having considered all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

C Searson
INSPECTOR