



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 July 2019 by S Witherley BA, PGDiP, PGDiP, Cert CIH, Assoc RTPI

Decision by **A U Ghafoor BSc (Hons) MA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26 July 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/P4415/W/19/3226760

1 Bank Street, South Anston, Rotherham, S25 5AD

- 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 Bracey against the decision of the Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application, Ref RB2018/1312, dated 15 August 2018, was refused by notice 15 October 2018.
 - The development proposed is for a two-storey side extension and change of use from a single dwelling to 4 self-contained flats.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issue

3. The refusal reason only refers to the two-storey side extension. The main issue is the effect of the extension upon the character and appearance on the host building and street scene.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal site comprises a two-storey semi-detached property sat at right angles in a prominent corner plot at the junction of Bank Street and Worksop Road. The property has a front and side garden which is set back from the highway and bounded by a mix or hedging, stone walling and timber fencing. The immediate surrounding area is characterised by properties of a similar scale, design and appearance.
 5. The proposal seeks to extend the existing property at the side with a two-storey extension with a stepped roof and flush with the main elevation. As a result of the proposal being flush with the front elevation at first floor, it would create an elongated and uninterrupted main elevation which would disrupt the symmetrical appearance of the original pair of semi-detached properties. The resultant extension would have a visually dominant effect and appear as an incongruous addition. It would unbalance the pair and not appear subservient. Given the design and layout, the development would visually harm the appearance of the original property.
-

6. Additionally, given the appeal location, the development would be visible from public vantages and it would detract from the symmetrical quality of the pattern of settlement. The extension would appear as an incongruous addition to the street out-of-keeping with the character of the street scene. The proposal would not secure high-quality design that responds to the local character and it would be inconsistent with advice found in the Householder Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document 2014 (HDG).
7. The appellant states that planning permission for an almost identical scheme has been granted but has submitted no details to support this claim. In any event, each development proposal is assessed on its own individual merits. Furthermore, the assertion is the Council has only a 3.2-year supply of deliverable housing land but has not submitted evidence of this. The Council on the other hand state they have a 5-year housing supply and have submitted a breakdown of this figure in their supporting statement.
8. I find that the proposed two-storey extension would have a visually harmful effect upon the character and appearance of the host building and street scene. Accordingly, the development would fail to comply with Policies CS28 of the Rotherham Local Plan Core Strategy 2013-2028 (2014) and Policy SP55 of the Rotherham Local Plan, Sites and Policies (2018). The other considerations advanced do not outweigh my findings on the main issue.

Conclusion and recommendation

10. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, it is recommended that the appeal should be dismissed.

S Witherley

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

11. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report, and, on that basis, I too agree that the appeal should be dismissed.

A U Ghafoor

INSPECTOR