
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 November 2019

by William Cooper BA (Hons) MA CMLI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10th December 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/P4415/D/19/3236137

8 Oakwood Road West, Broom, Rotherham S60 3AB

- 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 and Mrs Bibi against the decision of Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref: RB2019/0997, dated 25 June 2019, was refused by notice dated 20 August 2019.
 - The development proposed is demolition of existing outbuilding and erection of two storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for demolition of existing outbuilding and erection of two storey side extension at 8 Oakwood Road West, Broom, Rotherham S60 3AB in accordance with the terms of the application, RB2019/0997, dated 25 June 2019, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in strict accordance with the following approved drawings: Location Plan; Block Plan; MS/68/19-02A.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Procedural Matter

2. The description of development in the heading above is taken from the appeal form as it is more accurate than that in the application form.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site comprises a detached dwelling, located within a twentieth century housing estate which has a fairly spacious feel. There is some variety of building scale and pattern across the estate.

5. The ridge height of the proposed extension would be lower than that of the host building. The roof style of the proposal would match that of the latter. The width of the proposed extension's front elevation would be approximately 4.2m, and thus less than half the width of the host dwelling's width of approximately 10.8m. These aspects would accord with the guidance in the Rotherham Householder Design Guide Interim Planning Guidance (2014) (IPG).
6. The footprint of the proposed extension would be splayed to echo the side boundary, such that its rear elevation would be approximately 5.7m wide. Given this, the Council is concerned that the extension would not be sufficiently subordinate to the host building, and would appear prominently incongruous.
7. However, the appeal building sits in something of a dip, towards the lower end of the sloping Broom Valley Road, at a kink in the road, between two semi-detached pairs of houses - Nos 4 and 6, and Nos 12 and 14 - which are larger than average buildings for the street. This run of buildings on the north side of the street is characterised by noticeably larger width, bulk and diversity of architectural style than the more uniform pattern of smaller semi-detached pairs on the south side of the street. The proposed extension would side onto a modest sized garage court, which is not a through route, thus limiting potential visual receptors. The access to the garages, the wide driveway to No 10 and the height difference between the appeal site and No 12 combine to provide spaciousness between the side of the proposed extension and the latter building. Moreover, foliage, other buildings and boundaries would intervene to limit views of the proposed extension from other properties in the vicinity.
8. The width of the rear elevation of the proposed extension would exceed the IPG's guidance on extension-to-host building ratio by approximately 0.3m. However, I saw during my site visit that the above factors together give the appeal site a somewhat individual location, with capacity to accommodate the mass and bespoke splayed footprint of the proposed extension to the detached host building. Together, the above would help assimilate the proposed extension acceptably into the streetscene.
9. In conclusion, the conditions 'on the ground' are such that, whilst an aspect of the guidance in section 2.5 of the IPG would be exceeded to a small degree, the proposed development would not harm the appearance of the host building, or the character and appearance of the area. As such, the proposal would broadly accord with Policy CS28 of the Rotherham Core Strategy 2013-2028 (2014) and Policy SP55 of the Rotherham Sites and Policies Document (2018). Together, the policies seek, amongst other things, to ensure that development complements local context and character.

Conditions

10. In addition to the standard commencement condition, a condition is necessary requiring that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans, in order to provide certainty. A condition regarding materials is required to safeguard the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons above I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

William Cooper INSPECTOR