
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 July 2017

by Siobhan Watson BA(Hons) MCD MRTPI

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

Decision date: 12 July 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/P4415/D/17/3171621

39 Homestead Drive, Brinsworth, Rotherham, Yorkshire, S60 5AR

- 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 Mr Javid Malik against the decision of Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref RB2017/0056, dated 10 January 2017, was refused by notice dated 9 February 2017.
 - The development proposed is the erection of ground floor extensions to front and rear elevations and a first floor side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposed development upon:
 - (i) The character and appearance of the area; and
 - (ii) The living conditions of (a) the appeal dwelling's future occupiers in respect of outlook, and (b) the occupiers of the neighbouring dwelling at No 37 in respect of privacy.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

3. The dwelling is situated within a housing estate which is characterised by a predominance of semi-detached dwellings with hipped roofs. The appeal property is such a dwelling.
 4. The proposed two-storey side extension would have a gabled roof, whereas the existing pair both have hipped roofs. The proposed gable would be incongruous with the attached dwelling and with the predominant roof form of the area.
 5. The two storey extension would be wide and flush with the front of the house and its roof would be the same height as the main roof. Therefore, the extension would be a very substantial addition to the modestly sized dwelling. The proposal also includes the addition of a very wide front porch which would be about the full width of the existing dwelling. The combination of the wide side extension, the gable roof and the wide porch would spoil the symmetry of the existing pair of dwellings and the resultant dwelling would look
-

disproportionately large in comparison with the attached dwelling. As a result, the extended dwelling would appear incongruous within the street-scene.

6. I appreciate that similar extensions have been built in the area, including one nearby at 45 Homestead Drive, but I am not bound by other decisions of the Council and the existence of these extensions does not justify further harm.
7. Therefore, the proposed extension would harm the character and appearance of the area. Consequently, I find conflict with Policy CS 28 of the Rotherham Local Plan Core Strategy which seeks to ensure that development should respect local context and be visually attractive. It would also conflict with the Council's Householder Design Guide which has similar objectives. Furthermore, it would not accord with Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework which indicates that development should respond to local character and reflect the identity of local surroundings.

Living Conditions

8. Bedroom 3 would have its sole window in the new side elevation. The window would be very close to the side elevation of the neighbouring property, No 37. Therefore, being close to this neighbouring wall, the bedroom window would provide an enclosed and poor outlook for its future occupants. I note that the appellant has provided an amended plan to overcome this problem but I have based my decision upon the refused plans as the amended plan has not been subject to the usual neighbour notification procedure.
9. This new bedroom window would give only oblique views of the garden at No 37 and these views would be somewhat obscured by the flank wall of No 37 itself. Therefore, I do not consider that the proposed extension would adversely affect the privacy of the occupants of the neighbouring property.
10. However, due to the poor outlook from bedroom 3, I consider that the proposed extension would not provide an adequate standard of living conditions for its future occupiers. Therefore the proposal would conflict with CS Policy 28 which promotes good design. It would also conflict with the Council's Householder Design Guide, the aims and objectives of which seek to protect residential amenity including avoiding a poor outlook. Furthermore, it would conflict with Paragraph 17 of the Framework which indicates that planning should always seek to secure high quality design and a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings.

Conclusion

11. For the above reasons, I dismiss the appeal.

Siobhan Watson

INSPECTOR