



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 January 2022 by Darren Ellis MPlan

Decision by Hollie Nicholls FdA MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11 February 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/P4415/D/21/3284101

47 Dinnington Road, Woodsetts, Rotherham S81 8RL

- 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 Gareth Williams against the decision of Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref RB2021/1023, dated 14 May 2021, was refused by notice dated 8 July 2021.
 - The development proposed is two storey side and rear extensions and loft conversion.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for two storey side and rear extensions and loft conversion at 47 Dinnington Road, Woodsetts, Rotherham, S81 8RL, in accordance with the terms of the application RB2021/1023, dated 14 May 2021, subject to these conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Drawing 1 of 2 Existing Elevations and Floor Plans; and Drawing 2 of 2 Proposed Elevations and Floor Plans (both dated January 2021).
 - 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.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issue

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

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal site comprises a two-storey semi-detached dwelling located on Dinnington Road, Woodsetts. The immediate area comprises a mix of property types, however the appeal property is part of a group of three pairs of semi-
-

detached properties that are built to the same design. The proposed development would see the erection of a two-storey side and rear extension which, from the street, would match the design of the two-storey side extension at the adjoining property and thus would re-balance and reintroduce the symmetry of the semi-detached pair. The extension would be constructed in materials that would match the existing building and the design and proportions would respect the character of the original property.

5. A previous planning application for a two-storey side and rear extension¹ was approved in 2021. This scheme is an amended version of the appeal proposal, with the approved side extension set back from the front elevation and set down from the main roof in order to appear subservient to the main dwelling and to prevent a potential terracing effect should the adjacent neighbour at No 49 build a similar side extension in the future. Both the approved and proposed extensions would be built up to the side boundary with No 49. The approved extension is set back 0.33m which complies with the guidance of the Rotherham Local Plan Householder Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (June 2020) (SPD), however this limited set back is unlikely to meaningfully reduce the risk of any future terracing effect. Consequently, the proposed extension with its lack of set back would not cause a significantly greater risk of a terracing effect than the approved scheme.
6. The guidance in section 2.5 of the SPD seeks for two-storey side extensions to be set back 0.3m at the first-floor level in order to be subservient to the main house and to prevent it from unbalancing a pair of semi-detached properties. While I acknowledge that the proposed extension would conflict with the guidance in relation to subservience, the extension would re-balance the pair of semi-detached properties and as such would not look out of place in that context. Moreover, the driveway at No 49 would remain, providing a break between the properties which would help to avoid a terracing effect. The dwelling is also set slightly behind No 49 and the different building lines would help to mitigate against a terracing effect. As such, the design approach would not be out of character with the area.
7. For these reasons, whilst there would be some conflict with the SPD, the proposed extension would not cause harm to the character and appearance of the host property and street scene. As such the proposal would accord with policy CS28 of the Rotherham Local Plan Core Strategy (September 2014), policy SP55 of the Rotherham Local Plan Sites and Policies (June 2018) and the overarching aims of the SPD, which require developments to be of a high-quality design that are responsive to their context and positively contribute to the local character. The proposal would also comply with the design aims of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Conditions

8. In order to provide certainty and in the interests of proper planning it is necessary to impose the standard time limit and specify the approved plans. In the interests of the character and appearance of the area, a condition specifying that materials used match the existing dwelling is also necessary.

¹ Planning application ref. RB2021/0289

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given above the proposal conforms to the policies of the development plan and, having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be allowed and planning permission granted subject to the conditions listed above.

Darren Ellis

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

10. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and I agree with the recommendation and shall allow the appeal in the terms set out.

Hollie Nicholls

INSPECTOR