
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 July 2021

by C Coyne BA (Hons) DipTP DipERM MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16 July 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/P4415/D/21/3273396

43 Rosslyn Avenue, Aston, Rotherham S26 2DE

- 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 Mrs N. Purdy against the decision of Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref RB2021/0338, dated 16 February 2021, was refused by notice dated 8 April 2021.
 - The development proposed is two storey side and single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for two storey side and single storey rear extension at 43 Rosslyn Avenue, Aston, Rotherham S26 2DE in accordance with the terms of the application Ref RB2021/0338, dated 16 February 2021, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Proposed Floor Plans Drawing No. 03 Rev. C; Proposed Site Plan Drawing No. 05 Rev. B; Proposed Elevations Drawing No. 06.
 - 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.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a two-storey semi-detached dwelling situated within a predominately residential area. The surrounding properties mainly comprise similar two-storey semi-detached dwellings, some of which have two storey side extensions. The appeal property is at a bend in the road meaning that there is a large area of paved amenity space to the front and side of the dwelling which is currently used as a driveway/parking area. In addition, due to the orientation of the neighbouring property no. 41, and that of no. 43, there is a significant gap between their respective existing side elevations.

4. The adopted Householder Design Guide (SPD) states that two storey side extensions should generally be set back by a minimum of 0.3 metres at first floor level on the front elevation, with the roof set down and back from the main body of the house. It also states that any such extension should not exceed more than half the width of the original house.
5. The proposal would create a two-storey side extension and single storey rear extension to the host property. The two-storey element would be set back from the existing front building line of the host property by approximately 0.3 metres and the roof-ridge height would also be lower than that of the original dwelling meaning that the proposal would appear subservient to it when viewed from the street.
6. The two-storey side extension would also exceed more than half the width of the original house. However, even so, given its subservient design, the orientation of nos. 41 and 43, the large gap between them and the large amount of space to the front and side of the host property, the proposal would not cause a visual imbalance in the pair of semi-detached dwellings to which it belongs when viewed in this context. This would be the case particularly when viewed from further past no. 41 due to the bend in the road and the fact that, due to its orientation, the gable end of no. 47 would also be readily visible from this vantage point. It would therefore represent a complimentary addition to the street scene.
7. Consequently, I conclude that the proposed development would not materially harm the character and appearance of the area. Accordingly, it would meet the requirements of policy SP 55 of the adopted Rotherham Local Plan Sites and Policies Development Plan Document. It would also comply with paragraphs 124 and 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework).

Conditions

8. In addition to the standard implementation condition, I have imposed a necessary condition to define the plans with which the scheme should accord in the interest of precision. I have also imposed a condition requiring the use of matching materials in the interests of the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

9. Whilst there would be some technical conflict with the requirements of the SPD, this would not clearly and demonstrably outweigh the proposal's overall compliance with the development plan and the Framework when read as a whole. As a result, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

C Coyne

INSPECTOR