
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 July 2020

by A M Nilsson BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 4 August 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/P4415/D/20/3251597

31 Fir Tree Drive, Wales, Sheffield, South Yorkshire S26 5LZ

- 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 A Walker against the decision of Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref RB2019/2001, dated 22 December 2019 was refused by notice dated 14 February 2020.
 - The development proposed is a single storey front 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 host property and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a two-storey semi-detached property. It is situated in a predominantly residential area where there are a variety of property styles, many of which incorporate forward projecting bay windows and porches.
4. The appeal property has an existing flat-roofed bay window to the front that continues over the main entrance to create a canopy over the doorway. This approach is replicated at the adjoining property.
5. The proposed extension would bring the entire ground floor frontage forward by approximately 1m, incorporating a lean-to roof with rooflights. Due to its size and scale, particularly the forward projection, the extension would harmfully break the established building-line and the symmetry between the pair of semi-detached properties. Due to its design, size and scale, it would appear prominent and incongruous, and out of character with the surrounding properties.
6. Although I observed that several properties in the street have undergone alterations to the front elevation, these are typically through continuation of the front bay window in a sideward direction to form a covered porch, or the addition of a porch. I find that such examples are not directly comparable to the appeal proposal. Therefore, whilst I have acknowledged their presence, I

have given them limited weight in the appeal, which I have determined on its own individual merits.

7. I have been referred to the permitted development rights relating to the construction of porches as a fall-back position. I find that the appeal proposal comprising a front extension to the whole property, is not comparable to such an extension and therefore give this limited weight. In any event, I have determined the appeal proposal on its own individual merits.
8. I therefore conclude that the proposed extension would have a significantly adverse impact on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area. It would be contrary to Policy CS28 of the Rotherham Local Plan (2014) and Policy SP55 of the Rotherham Local Plan (Sites and Policies) (2018). These policies require, amongst other things, that development proposals should be visually attractive, be of high quality, having regard to setting of the site, including the size, scale, mass, volume, height, orientation, form, and grain of surrounding development.
9. The proposal would also be contrary to guidance contained in the Rotherham Householder Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (2014) which outlines, amongst other things, that on semi-detached properties single storey extensions that extend across the entire frontage will normally be refused as they often fail to respect the character of the host property and damage the appearance of the overall street scene.
10. The proposal would conflict with guidance contained in the National Planning Policy Framework (2019) that outlines, amongst other things, that planning decisions should ensure that developments add to the overall quality of the area; are visually attractive as a result of good architecture; are sympathetic to local character, including the surrounding built environment; and that permission should be refused for development of poor design that fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area.

Conclusion

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

A M Nilsson

INSPECTOR