
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on

by Sarah Manchester BSc MSc PhD MEnvSc

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16th October 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/P4415/D/19/3234222

69 Normanville Avenue, Brinsworth, Rotherham S60 5AL

- 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 Wayne Wasnidge against the decision of Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref RB2019/0882, dated 04 June 2019, was refused by notice dated 22 July 2019.
 - The development proposed is single storey hall and lounge extension to front of 69 Normanville Avenue, Brinsworth.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and the area.

Reasons

3. No 69 is a 2 storey semi-detached property in a residential area characterised by properties of similar ages and styles, constructed in brick with simple front elevations and pitched tile roofs. Properties are regularly spaced and set back from Normanville Avenue on consistent building lines, with generally open front gardens with either low or no front boundary treatments. Consequently, the area has a uniform and harmonious character and appearance.
4. The proposed full width extension would finish just below the first floor windows. By virtue of its width and height, it would be out of proportion with, and it would dominate, the front elevation of the host property. The pitch roof gable feature would protrude forwards beyond the lounge extension. The overall effect would be a cluttered and discordant front elevation. Irrespective that it would re-use the existing windows and doors and that it would be constructed in materials to match the host property, the proposal would not respect the simple character of the host property.
5. Notwithstanding some variation in the style of windows and doors, No 69 nevertheless forms part of a group of matching properties in this part of the street that have retained their original front elevations. The prominent front extension would unbalance the pair of semi-detached properties and it would disrupt the consistency of the group and the street scene. Consequently, it

would be an incongruous feature that would not make a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness.

6. My attention has been drawn to other properties in the area with extensions to their front elevations. Full details of those schemes are not before me, and I cannot therefore be certain that they benefit from planning permission or that they were considered in the current policy context. In any case, they appear to differ from the appeal scheme including in terms of their height, width and design, their relationship to the host property and the surrounding context including plot sizes, siting and neighbouring properties. They are not therefore directly comparable to the appeal scheme, which I have considered on its own merits. Moreover, extensions elsewhere do not provide a visual context for the appeal scheme and they do provide a justification for the proposal.
7. Therefore, the proposal would result in significant harm to the character and appearance of the appeal property and the area. It would conflict with Policy SP55 of the Rotherham Local Plan Sites and Policies Adopted June 2018, Policy CS28 of the Rotherham Local Plan Core Strategy Adopted September 2014. These require, among other things, that development responds to the surrounding context and townscape, makes a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness and develops a strong sense of place. It would conflict with the Council's Householder Design Guide Interim Planning Guidance Adopted March 2014 in relation to extensions to front elevations. It would conflict with policies in the National Planning Policy Framework that require development to improve the character and quality of the area, taking into account local guidance.

Other Matters

8. While I appreciate the appellant's desire to extend his property to provide additional internal living accommodation, there is little before me to demonstrate that No 69 is currently unsuitable to be occupied by a family or that the housing stock in the district would become unsustainable if the appeal should fail. Notwithstanding that the appellant has discounted other forms of extension, I am not persuaded that there are no alternative proposals that would deliver substantially the same benefits without the conflict with the development plan.
9. I acknowledge that the proposal would not result in the loss of off-street parking provision and it would not impact upon the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring properties. However, compliance with some policies in the development plan is not a benefit in favour of the scheme. Similarly, the absence of third party objections to the proposals is a matter that carries limited weight in my assessment.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons set out above, the appeal should therefore be dismissed.

Sarah Manchester

INSPECTOR