

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 31 January 2022

by David Fitzsimon MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21 February 2022.

Appeal Ref: APP/P4415/D/21/3287933

36 Boundary Green, Rawmarsh, Rotherham S62 6JF

- 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 Paul Rigby against the decision of Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref RB2021/1715, dated 2 September 2021, was refused by notice dated 30 September 2021.
 - The development proposed is a single storey front extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed extension on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the street scene.

Reasons

3. The appeal relates to a modern dwelling which sits within a road of broadly similar properties.
 4. The appeal property has been the subject of a two storey extension to the side with a single storey section projecting forward of the principal elevation with a mono-pitch roof. The proposal seeks to extend the mono-pitch section across the majority of the frontage of the appeal dwelling, stopping just short of the boundary with the attached dwelling, No. 34 Boundary Green.
 5. This attached property has not been extended in the same manner. As a result, the existing two storey extension at the appeal property has inevitably resulted in some of the original symmetry of these dwellings being eroded. However, the two storey extension is set down from the main ridge and the first floor element is recessed from the principal elevation of the host dwelling, which ensures a degree of subservience.
 6. The proposed extension would be small in its own right, but it would connect with the existing extension and the effect would wrap around the majority of the frontage of the host dwelling. Whilst the existing mono-pitch roof would be continued and the external finishing materials would be an appropriate match,
-

the proposal would result in the loss of the existing bay window. When read alongside the existing addition, the proposed extension would engulf the original dwelling, altering its original design and proportions considerably.

7. This would be in direct conflict with the advice contained within the Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Document titled '*Householder Design Guide*' (SPD) which explains that extensions should not dominate the house by being bigger, higher or set forward (towards the street) and that extending a house in that way will make it look imbalanced and incongruous particularly if neighbouring houses are similar in design. It goes on to recommend that bay windows should be retained and single storey extensions that extend across the entire frontage of terraced and semi-detached dwellings will normally be refused.
8. I note that the ground floor fenestrations of the appeal dwelling and No. 34 Boundary Green are not an exact match. However, given the above factors, I consider that the proposed extension would unduly imbalance this pair of attached dwellings, which enjoy a prominent position within Boundary Green. The harmful visual effect would be widely visible and would detract from an otherwise well ordered street scene, where attached properties are reasonably balanced and sit comfortably alongside each other in the main.
9. I am mindful that the proposed extension would be set off the boundary with No. 34 Boundary Green and this design is a direct attempt to address the Council's concerns relating to an earlier scheme which did not secure planning permission. Whilst the Appellant points to the fact that the loss of the bay window was not cited as a reason why the earlier scheme was unsuccessful, I have considered the scheme before me on its merits. I also note that the proposed extension would not harm the living conditions of the occupiers of No. 34 Boundary Green in any way, but this is a neutral factor in the overall planning balance.
10. For the above reasons, I conclude that the proposed extension would harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling when viewed alongside the attached dwelling, which in turn would harm the character of the street scene. In such terms, it conflicts with policies CS28 and SP55 of the adopted Rotherham Local Plan and the SPD which promote high quality design that respects and enhances local character and distinctiveness.
11. Accordingly, the appeal does not succeed.

David Fitzsimon

INSPECTOR