



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 February 2020 by Andreea Spataru BA (Hons) MA

Decision by Sarah Housden BA (Hons) BPL MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27th February 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/P4415/D/19/3241892

66 Gileswood Crescent, Brampton Bierow, Rotherham S63 6BU

- 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 & Mrs Woodcock against the decision of Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref RB2019/1238, dated 6 August 2019, was refused by notice dated 13 September 2019.
 - The development proposed is a first floor side extension above existing garage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a first floor side extension above the existing garage at 66 Gileswood Crescent, Brampton Bierow, Rotherham S63 6BU in accordance with the terms of application Ref RB2019/1238, dated 6 August 2019 and subject to the following conditions:
 1. The development hereby permitted shall begin no later than three years from the date of this decision.
 2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Block Plan/Location Plan Drawing No.1, Proposed Site Plan Drawing No.2, Proposed Elevations Drawing No.4, Proposed Floor Plans Drawing No. 6, Existing & Proposed Roof Plans & Section Drawing No. 7.
 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.

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 main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and the streetscene.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal property is a detached, two storey, pitched roofed dwelling located within a predominantly residential area characterised by a mix of detached,
-

semi-detached and terraced properties. The appeal dwelling has a single storey garage attached to the side, which projects slightly beyond the front elevation. Neighbouring properties have a similar design to the appeal dwelling and have been extended in a similar manner proposed for the appeal dwelling.

5. Policy CS 28 of the Rotherham Local Plan Core Strategy 2013-2028 (CS) and Policy SP 55 of the Rotherham Local Plan Sites and Policies document (LPSP), require, amongst other things, that development respects the character and scale of the host dwelling and is in keeping with the character of the locality.
6. The Householder Design Guide Interim Planning Guidance (March 2014) (IPG) provides more specific guidance for domestic extensions, including side extensions. It states that it is usually preferable for an extension to be subordinate in scale to the original house. A lower roofline and setting back the extension behind the dwelling's building line will allow the existing house to remain dominant. Where an extension is to be the same height and depth as the original house the existing roofline should be carried over the extension, and the same roof style and materials should be used. It also advises that on a gabled property it may be acceptable to create a flush extension, not set back from the main body of the dwelling, providing it would not cause a serious terracing effect.
7. The proposal would provide a first-floor extension to the side, above the existing garage. The extension would not exceed more than half the width of the original dwelling and it would not project along the full depth of the existing garage. It would be in line with the existing first floor, would have a pitched roof and would follow the main ridge line. The materials are proposed to match those of the host dwelling. Whilst the extension would not be set-down or set-back, given its width and overall scale, it would appear proportionate and subordinate in scale to the original dwelling. The matching roof style and materials would also ensure that the extension is well incorporated into the original dwelling. Thus, the development would not be harmful to the character and appearance of the host dwelling.
8. The appeal property is at a slightly lower level than neighbouring property No 64 and it is also slightly set-back in relation to it. Both properties are well set back from the road. Whilst the extension would fill in a gap at the first-floor level, there would still be a clear separation between the two detached dwellings. Thus, the development would not lead to a terracing effect and it would not be detrimental to the character and appearance of the streetscene.
9. In light of the above, I conclude that the appeal development would not adversely affect the character and appearance of the host dwelling nor would it be unduly prominent or noticeable in the streetscene. Consequently, the development would not conflict with the aims of CS Policy CS 28 or LPSP Policy SP 55. Whilst the scheme would not fully accord with the advice in the IPG, each case must be considered on its merits and based on the circumstances of this site and the appeal proposal before me, I conclude that the extension would not be harmful to the host property and would not be unduly prominent in the streetscene.

Conditions and Recommendation

10. In the interests of proper planning and to provide certainty I have recommended the standard time limit condition and have specified the

approved plans. In order to protect the character and appearance of the area a condition that specifies that matching materials are used in the development is necessary. These conditions have also been suggested by the Council in the event that the appeal was allowed.

11. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be allowed subject to these conditions.

Andreea Spataru

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

12. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is allowed.

Sarah Housden

INSPECTOR