



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 November 2019

by Mr W Johnson BA(Hons) DipTP DipUDR MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19 December 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/P4415/D/19/3233774

9 Greenfield Gardens, Flanderwell, Rotherham S66 2JG

- 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 Robert Borrington against the decision of Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref RB2019/0671, dated 28 April 2019, was refused by notice dated 24 June 2019.
 - The development proposed is a two-storey side extension.
-

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 appeal site and surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The host property is a modest semi-detached dwelling occupying a prominent location in the street scene, which is in the form of a cul-de-sac. The site is positioned adjacent to a public footpath (the footpath) that links Greenfield Gardens and Fleming Way. This footpath has a notable grass verge behind the rear gardens of existing dwellings, extending its width. This creates a spacious arrangement between the host dwelling and neighbouring properties, which I find is a prominent and distinctive feature throughout the estate that positively contributes to the character of the area.
4. The proposed development seeks to erect a 2-storey side extension on part of the garden to the host dwelling. Whilst there is no specific policy objection to the principle of a residential extension, I note that the appeal scheme would extend a notable width of the building, that would extend much closer to the footpath. The host dwelling has retained a clear sense of balance and symmetry relative to the adjoining property, which accordingly contributes towards a positive feature of the wider street scene.
5. The proposal comprises an overly wide addition to the host dwelling relative to its existing proportions. The adverse effect of the proposal is accentuated through the lack of a lower ridge line or set back from the existing front elevation. These factors would diminish and unbalance the character and appearance of the host building to the detriment of the wider street scene. Although the appeal site benefits from an open area in the form of the footpath

to its side, this would not provide sufficient mitigation to overcome the harmful effect of the proposal.

6. The appellant refers to numerous properties that have been extended similar to the proposed development, but no details have been provided regarding the particular planning backgrounds to these schemes. Without such information a detailed comparison between the other schemes and the case before me cannot be drawn.
7. For all of these reasons, I therefore conclude that the proposed extension would unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the appeal site and surrounding area. This would be contrary to the design, character and appearance aims of Policies CS28 and SP55 of the Rotherham Local Plan Core Strategy 2013 to 2028 (2014), the Council's Interim Planning Guidance – Householder Design Guide 2014, and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Other Matters

8. I have also noted the appellant's suggestion regarding the possibility of erecting a single storey extension and then a first-floor extension above, but the likelihood and merits of such a proposal are not before this appeal. I note the Council raise no objections to the proposal in respect of living conditions. However, a lack of harm associated with living conditions is a neutral factor that weighs neither for nor against the development.
9. I have also had regard to various other matters raised by the appellant, including his need to develop additional accommodation, but on the evidence before me these are not reasons to grant permission in the face of the harm identified. I also note the concerns raised by the appellant about the way that the Council handled the application, but this does not affect the planning merits of the case. I have considered this appeal proposal on its own merits and concluded that it would cause harm for the reasons set out above.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above, I therefore conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

W Johnson

INSPECTOR