



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 November 2021

by Graham Wright BA(Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 9 December 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/P4415/D/21/3282376

37 Manor Fields, Kimberworth, Rotherham S61 1PB

- 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 Nick Shem against the decision of Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref RB2021/0684, dated 18 March 2021, was refused by notice dated 16 June 2021.
 - The development proposed is a two storey side extension, build over existing single storey side.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. The proposed plans were amended during the course of the planning application and I have therefore made my determination of the appeal on the basis of the plan provided, this being 2021-058-03 Revision A.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The appeal dwelling sits towards the end of Manor Fields, close to where the road adjoins with that of the adjacent school. It forms one half of a pair of semi-detached dwellings, with an identical pair located at a lower ground level at 33 and 35 Manor Fields, none of which presently have two storey side extensions. Due to the rising topography of the road and the positioning of adjacent dwellings, the appeal property and in particular its side elevation have prominence within the street scene. There is a generous amount of separation between the existing dwellings on this part of Manor Fields and they are also well set back from the public highway. This creates a sense of spaciousness and contributes positively to the character and appearance of the area.
5. The proposed extension would extend across most of the area to the side of the appeal dwelling. Its width would be substantial in relation to that of the host dwelling, exceeding that set out in the Householder Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document 2020 (SPD) which states that two storey side extensions should not exceed more than half the width of the original house. Whilst the SPD provides only guidance, it sets out the Council's clear expectations as to how extensions may be accommodated in a manner that would achieve its design objectives.

6. Due to the width of the proposed development, it would visually dominate the host dwelling by failing to achieve subserviency to it. Furthermore, it would place a two storey gable close to the common boundary with 35 Manor Fields, where it would be prominently positioned and visually dominant in views taken up the road. It would also considerably erode the spaciousness between the dwellings which is a positive contributor to this part of the road. The impact would be further exacerbated by the proposed use of render as the external facing material, which is not a prevalent material in the locality. As a result of these factors, the proposal would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the area.
7. Reference is made to the existing single storey side extension which has a flat roof and therefore does not itself accord with the guidance set out in the SPD. Be that as it may, this is an existing structure of a modest size which is not comparable to the scale of the appeal proposal. That it would be removed as part of the proposed development is not a benefit that outweighs the harm that would be caused as a result of the proposal. Whilst there are a mix of house designs and types in the area, including dwellings that have been extended and terraced properties, the harmful impact of the proposed extension would occur in the context I have set out.
8. It is also stated that the existing dwelling could be rendered without needing planning permission, but there is no firm indication that it is the appellant's intention to do so. In any event, the large side two storey gable wall of the proposed extension would have a more visually dominant impact on views taken up Manor Fields towards the appeal property than the present gable wall. Any potential fallback that may exist would not therefore be comparable to the impact that would arise from the appeal proposal. The fact that the appeal property is not listed or in a conservation area does not justify the use of render.
9. My attention has been drawn to another appeal decision in Rotherham, but I do not have any substantive details in relation to that case. However, irrespective of this, I must make my determination of this appeal primarily on the merits of the proposal that is before me. The proposed development would have some benefits in terms of its input to the local economy as a result of its construction and I acknowledge that it is required to accommodate a growing family. However, these considerations do not outweigh the harm that I have identified.
10. For these reasons, I conclude that the proposed development would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the area. Consequently, the proposal would fail to accord with Policies CS28 and SP55 of the Rotherham Local Plan 2014, where they seek to safeguard character and appearance. There would also be a conflict with the aims of the SPD in the same respect and with The National Planning Policy Framework where it seeks to achieve well-designed places.

Conclusion

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

Graham Wraight

INSPECTOR