



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 January 2021

by R Hitchcock BSc(Hons) DipCD MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12 January 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/P4415/D/20/3259533

18 Mortain Road, Rotherham S60 3BX

- 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 Choudhury against the decision of Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref RB2020/0014, dated 22 December 2019, was refused by notice dated 9 July 2020.
 - The development proposed is a two storey extension over existing ground floor.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and its locality.

Reasons

3. The site lies within a residential area of individually designed dwellings. Buildings in the locality are set behind open landscaped front gardens with private amenity spaces to the rear. The detached two storey dwelling with attached single storey garage within the site has previously been extended at ground floor to the front and rear. The building is set behind an open paved forecourt and lawn and extends to cover much of the width of the plot.
4. The proposal seeks to extend the building above the existing single-storey elements to the front and side of the main body of the dwelling. The design would retain the existing eaves line but require an increase in the main ridge and chimney stack heights. Front and rear gables would be formed above the garage and a previous rear extension, resulting in a 'T' ridge plan. The proposal would utilise external finishes to match those present on the existing building.
5. Like many of the house types in the locality, the original building was designed with a stepped frontage with the double garage being set forward of the main front elevation. The previous ground floor front addition extends to the same line and is the intended forward alignment of the first-floor extensions. The resultant width of two-storey development arising from the proposal would be substantial and almost fill the width of the plot. It would almost double the amount of two storey development on the site.
6. This would result in a forward elevation of significant extent and on a single plane of development. Although the front gable is reflective of other features in the locality and adds visual interest, its height, along with the overall height

increase of the dwelling, would serve to emphasise the significant increase in the scale of the building. Furthermore, notwithstanding the ample space to the side, where a public footpath and gap exists to the neighbouring dwelling, this scale, when viewed with the continuous extended depth of the proposed side elevation would give rise to a building of significant bulk and massing. The resultant building would appear prominent and conflict with the predominant scale of development in the locality.

7. At the time of my site inspection I noted other examples of large side extensions. Of those instances, it was not always the case that the extensions were set back and/or down from the front elevation of the main ridgeline as advocated by the Council's Householder Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document [2020] (SPD). However, despite the likelihood that those extensions pre-dated the SPD, the majority of those cases benefit from building elements or features that break up the massing of the principal elevations and avoid the single continuous plane of development proposed. Although the porch canopy would be retained within the frontage, this would be of little significance against the combined scale of the proposals.
8. I acknowledge that the extensions would be contained within the footprint of existing development and, as forward and side extensions to the first floor, do not strictly fall within the definition of a two-storey side extension as referenced in the Council's SPD. In the circumstances where a front extension has previously been added, I consider that there is merit in an approach to find a more consolidated appearance for the building. As recognised by the Council, despite masking the original building, the forward extension of the main element of the existing building would appear acceptable. This would reinstate the simplicity of form, albeit with a greater scale compared to the original. However, this remodelling does not, in itself, justify the significant alteration of the building's character through substantial changes to its overall massing and scale arising from the combined effect of the forward and side extensions.
9. For those reasons, I find that the proposal would cause significant harm to the character of the existing building and its locality through the resultant scale and massing of development. It would conflict with Policy CS28 of the Rotherham Local Plan Core Strategy 2013-2028 [2014] and Policy SP55 of the Rotherham Local Plan Sites and Policies [2018] as they seek to secure high standards of design which reflect local context and distinctiveness.

Conclusion

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

R Hitchcock

INSPECTOR