



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 July 2023

by Eleni Randle BSc (hons) MSc FRICS FAAV MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 4TH August 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/P4415/D/23/3317153

66 School Road, Wales, Rotherham, S26 5QJ

- 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 Christopher Bacon against the decision of Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref RB2022/1807 dated 1 December 2022, was refused by notice dated 24 January 2023.
 - The development proposed is erection of a single-storey front extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the impact of the proposal upon the character and appearance of the host property, pair of semi-detached dwellings and the street scene.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is a semi-detached dwelling located off School Road where the dwellings to the eastern end, towards the M1, are typically semi-detached dwellings. At the time of my site visit, I parked close to Cherry Tree Road and walked back along School Road and noted that whilst the front elevations of the properties within the vicinity of the appeal site have undergone some alterations, such alterations are limited generally to porch extensions and do not extend across the full width of the front elevation. The only exception to this is the last property, to the east adjacent to the M1, which benefits from a front extension which appeared to link into a side extension in an overall large plot. Overall, I found that the character and appearance of the semi-detached dwellings within the vicinity of the appeal site was varied. The only consistent feature, realistically, is the roof form, with the dwellings themselves along the overall row being subject to differing sized windows, differing materials, cladding and overall finish.
4. Despite the wider variation I find that any alterations have generally retained the balance between the respective pairs of dwellings with each pair retaining similar features and the alterations to the front elevations do not consume the front of the properties in question with no examples of modern design or full-length windows. The glazing would therefore be uncharacteristic within the streetscene. The appeal site itself is a semi-detached dwelling, with the neighbouring dwelling sharing the same bay window feature, which would be lost. The proposal, would ultimately, result in a single storey front extension

which would link with the existing porch to the front elevation, lose the bay window feature and would cover the entire front elevation of the host dwelling. I find that this would unbalance the pair of semi-detached properties and that the modern design, with full length windows, would be incongruous feature of the dwellinghouse itself which is traditional in appearance.

5. The appellant has submitted photographs as their appeal submission, however, no explanation as to the location or relevance of the images submitted is provided to enable me to attribute weight to them within the context of the appeal proposal before me. Notwithstanding this, each case should be considered on its own merits, and I do not find that such development to the front elevation of properties in the vicinity of the appeal site is characteristic. I do, however, note that one of the photographs relates to a property at the other end of School Road as I noted it at the time of my site visit. I have no further information before me as to the front extension on the property in question, however, within this row, I would consider it to be an isolated example of an unbalanced pair which is contained several properties away from the appeal site. The presence of this extension, at 50 School Road, does not change my assessment as to the impact upon the host dwelling itself with regard to the loss of the bay window, which is a characteristic which currently balances the pair of semi-detached dwellings as outlined above.
6. The proposal would be contrary to Rotherham Local Plan Core Strategy 2014 Policy CS28, which requires that design should take opportunities to improve the character and quality of an area and that the design process should take into account townscape character including building styles and materials of the built form. The proposal would also be contrary to Rotherham Local Plan Sites and Policies 2018 Policy SP55, which requires that all forms of development are required to be of high quality and proportionate to the scale, nature, location, and sensitivity of development with regard for the setting of the site as well as an assessment of architectural detailing.
7. The Council's Householder Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document 2020 further advises that front extensions can significantly alter the appearance of a building and that in general, bay windows should be retained and on terraced and semi-detached properties single storey extensions that extend across the entire frontage will normally be refused. Front extensions should not harm the character and appearance of the host property or be of a design which is out of keeping with others in the street. The proposal would also be contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework 2021, paragraph 130 which amongst other things seeks to ensure that developments are sympathetic to local character and add to the overall quality of the area.

Conclusion

8. For the reasons outlined above, and taking account all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Eleni Randle

INSPECTOR