



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 12 October 2021

by Ian Radcliffe BSc(Hons) MRTPI MCIEH DMS

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18 October 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/P4415/D/21/3275313

66 Muirfield Avenue, Swinton, Rotherham S64 8TF

- 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 S Wright against the decision of Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref RB2021/0233, dated 15 January 2021, was refused by notice dated 15 April 2021.
 - The development proposed is demolition of garage and erection of two storey side/rear and single storey front extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. Muirfield Avenue forms part of a housing estate constructed in the latter half of the last century. Semi-detached, two storey houses set back from the pavement behind short, open gardens are the predominant form of housing along the Avenue. The predominant symmetrical appearance of the semi-detached pairs of houses, together with the regular gaps separating them, creates an attractive rhythm of development in the streetscene.
4. The left hand side of the front elevation of the existing house is set forward slightly of the right side. The proposed side extension would add further articulation by being set forward of the left hand side of the house at ground floor level and set back slightly at first floor level. Together with the pitched roof over the ground floor of the extension and front door this would add visual interest. However, in not setting down the height of the extension in relation to the existing dwelling the original form of the house would be lost. As a consequence, the extension would appear as if it was part of the dwelling's original design, with the increase in width that would occur unbalancing the pair of semi-detached houses of which it forms a part.
5. This would be contrary to the recently adopted supplementary planning document 'Householder Design Guide' (SPD) which states that the roof of a two storey side extension should be set down in height in relation to the house to create a subservient extension and avoid the adverse effects that I have described.
6. A number of semi-detached houses on the avenue have a two storey side extension constructed flush with the front elevation and the roof line which has

unbalanced the semi-detached pair of which they form a part. However, it appears to me that they predate the recently adopted SPD and are too few in number and too far apart to have changed the character of the Avenue to the extent that the appeal proposal would fit in.

7. For all of these reasons, I therefore conclude that the proposed development would constitute poor design and would unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the street. This would be contrary to policy CS28 of the Rotherham Local Plan Core Strategy and policy SP55 of the Rotherham Local Plan Sites and Policies Document. These policies require the protection of the character and appearance of a locality through high quality design that respects local design features.

Conclusion

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

Ian Radcliffe

Inspector