



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 3 December 2020

by A M Nilsson BA (Hons) Dip TP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15 December 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/P4415/D/20/3259791

12 Hepworth Drive, Aston, Rotherham, S26 2BG

- 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 Armatyge against the decision of Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref RB2020/0989, dated 26 June 2020, was refused by notice dated 28 August 2020.
 - The development proposed is a two-storey side extension with gable end roof & single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. The development has been undertaken. I am therefore considering the appeal retrospectively.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a two-storey, semi-detached dwelling. It is located in a predominantly residential area where there are properties of a similar design to the appeal property.
5. Prior to the development taking place, the property had a hipped roof. This is a particular characteristic of the similar properties in the area including many of those that have been extended at the side. The development has removed the hipped roof and replaced it with a gable roof over the first-floor extension, where the ridge and eaves lines are continuous with those of the main body of the dwelling. The first-floor element of the extension has been set back from the front building line of the main body of the dwelling.
6. Due to its design, failing to replicate the form of the roof of the main part of the dwelling and failing to incorporate a step-down from the ridge, the roof of the extension appears incongruous and harmfully unbalances the pair of semi-detached properties. It does not appear subordinate to the main body of the property.
7. The combination of the setback from the building line in relation to the first floor extension, and the lack of any setback from the roof lines of the main

body of the dwelling has resulted in a deep overhang that is unsightly and results in the roof appearing overly dominant.

8. I therefore find that the roof of the extension causes harm to the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area. It is contrary to Policies CS28 and 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 is also contrary to the Householder Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) (2020) which, in relation to two-storey side extensions, states that the roof should be set down and back from the main body of the house, the roof style of the extension should match that of the host property, and where the semi is hipped, the extension should have a hipped roof.
10. The proposal also conflicts with Chapter 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the 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.

Other Matters

11. The appellant has referred to difficulties they have experienced with the builder. This is not, however, an issue that would justify allowing harmful development.
12. I am referred to a number of alterations to properties in the surrounding area that incorporate various roof forms, including as a result of being extended. I do not have full details of these cases. Some of the examples serve to confirm the harm that can be done in relation to inappropriate extensions and roof designs. I have, in any event, determined the appeal on its own individual planning merits.
13. The appellant highlights that the development was largely completed by April 2018, a date which pre-dates the Council's adoption of the SPD in June 2020. I have determined the appeal on the basis of the material considerations relevant at the time of my decision.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

A M Nilsson

INSPECTOR