



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 December 2019

by Mr W Johnson BA(Hons) DipTP DipUDR MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 24th December 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/P4415/D/19/3237402

87 Nursery Road, North Anston, Rotherham S25 4BT

- 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 Matthew Walker against the decision of Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref RB2019/0869, dated 30 May 2019, was refused by notice dated 30 August 2019.
 - The development proposed is described as: 'Loft Conversion with full width dormer to rear elevation. Dark grey cladding and window frames'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue of the appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the appeal site and surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a semi-detached house on Nursery Road, which is a long linear road. The host dwelling is of brick construction with decorative hung tiles on the front elevation encompassing the bay window, and a tiled hipped roof. The proposal seeks alterations to the roof, through the introduction of a gable end and a dormer extension on the rear roof slope.
4. The host dwelling forms part of a small group of semi-detached houses that are similar in design and on the same side of the road as the host dwelling. The wider street scene consists of a mixture of house types, where hipped roofs are a predominant feature that are clearly visible when viewed from the front. This forms a strong and positive characteristic in the street scene, meaning I consider that the appeal site is located within a row of similar properties that have maintained a sense of rhythm and balance and are then supported by other hipped roof dwellings on the same side of the road.
5. The proposed development through its design and form, with particular regard to the gable end would result in an incongruous addition that would dominate the roof, fundamentally altering its shape and unbalancing its form and relationship with its neighbouring dwellings, in particular the adjoining house. The resulting significant adverse effect on the host property would be readily visible in the street scene to the detriment of character and appearance of the surrounding area.

6. I note the Council's concerns in the Officer Report and Decision Notice focus on the hip to gable conversion. I agree with the Council in this regard, as during my visit, I found that the proposed rear dormer would not be particularly visible from the street and would therefore have a limited effect on the surrounding area. Additionally, I do not consider that the proposed rear dormer would harm the appearance of the host dwelling.
7. Whilst I note the appellant's comments in relation to the facing materials and how they will be more modern, but this appears only to be in relation to the dormer. In any event, this would not provide sufficient mitigation to outweigh the harm otherwise arising. In his representations, the appellant has made reference to works allowed under permitted development. However, no additional details have been provided, and without this detailed information a comparison between this alternative scheme and the case before me cannot be drawn. Additionally, as there is little to indicate a reasonable prospect of such development taking place, little weight can be given to this matter.
8. My attention has been drawn to another dormer in the area¹. Whilst noting the presence of this extension, relatively little detail has been provided regarding the particular planning background to this scheme. Without such information a full and detailed comparison between this development and the case before me cannot be made, except insofar, as I was able to observe and assess the site at my visit. In any event, the fact that a dormer using white cladding may exist is not a reason, on its own, to allow otherwise unacceptable development. I have considered this appeal proposal on its own merits and concluded that it would cause harm for the reasons set out above.
9. For the above reasons, I therefore conclude that the proposed hip to gable conversion and rear dormer would unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the appeal site and the 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.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above, the appeal should be dismissed.

W Johnson

INSPECTOR

¹ 10 Warwick Way (S25 4EB)