



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 September 2023

by A. J. Boughton MA (IPSD) Dip.Arch. Dip.(Conservation) RIBA MRTPI
an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19 October 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/P4415/D/23/3326040 **25 The Green Rotherham S60 3AD**

- 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 Mrs Zara Khan against the decision of Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref: RB2023/0550 dated 20 April 2023 was refused by notice dated 28 June 2023.
 - The development proposed is porch to front, two storey extensions to side and rear, loft conversion, detached garage and new boundary treatment.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for porch to front, two storey extensions to side and rear, loft conversion, detached garage and new boundary treatment at 25 The Green Rotherham S60 3AD in accordance with the terms of the application Ref: RB2023/0550 dated 20 April 2023 and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following condition:
 - 1) The permission hereby granted relates to the development identified as 'as built' appearing on drawings numbered: DRW01 and DRW02.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal upon the character and appearance of 25 The Green Rotherham and of the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. Twenty-five The Green (No.25) is a semi-detached house overlooking a large expanse of open space surrounded by two-storey family housing dating from the post-war¹ decades, mostly in semi-detached pairs. This is a retrospective planning application as works have been carried out but not entirely in accordance with plans approved². No.25 is located at a junction with a side road such that its side elevation and in consequence, the bulk of the extended building, is prominent in the street scene, not merely the principal elevation.
4. The Council indicate that the works as carried out differ in one material respect from what has been previously approved which is that the ridge line of the extension does not 'step down' in the way shown on approved drawings. The Council refer to a street scene of 'similar style properties' pointing to the divergence from the approved plans as creating an 'over-dominant addition'

¹ From circa 1950

² The Council have not made the original consent available

'giving the appearance of an unbalanced pair of semi-detached properties' as an 'incongruous addition' to the street scene.

5. I note that some dwellings around The Green appear to have been extended at the side with an unbroken line of ridge, but turning to the dwelling pair which includes the appeal site, significant differences include the fenestration of the principal elevations of the dwelling pair, the addition of a large entrance porch to No.25 and a side extension which appears to fall outwith the guidance as to appropriate width set out in the Householder Design Guide SPD 2020 (SPD).³ The result is an absence of any symmetry such that No.25 has the character of an individual dwelling that happens to be attached to another property rather than being one of an extended pair.
6. However whilst my observations tend to align with the Council's concerns, this situation does not arise solely, or even substantially, from the absence of a stepped ridge line at the point where the side extension attaches to the original building as the Council suggest, nor from a failure to adhere to guidance which, from my reading, is not unequivocal as to the benefits of guidance when individual circumstances might be better addressed by skilled design. Overall, the impact on the street scene derives almost entirely from what the Council appear to have approved in the original permission⁴, an over-wide and deep side extension and a divergence in elevational treatment in a prominent corner location. These are elements of the design that individually may be of little consequence but cumulatively have removed the visual balance which is present in most of the nearby dwelling pairs.
7. The Council are considering enforcement action on the basis that the development is 'detrimental to the streetscene' suggesting that the roof of the side extension should be lowered and, to maintain the relationship, the roof of the rear extension with it. Whilst design guidance such as the SPD plays an important part in the pursuit of high quality design and the achievement of sustainable development, in this case (and in the context of what has been already permitted by the Council) little weight can be attached to the conflict identified with the SPD⁵ since very little, if any, planning harm would be undone by what would be highly disruptive and disproportionately expensive works to adjust the height of the roof surfaces of the extended parts.
8. For that reason, taking all matters raised into account, I conclude that the development which is the subject of this appeal accords with the development plan taken as a whole and that the appeal should succeed subject to a plans condition which is necessary for the purposes of clarity. As the works have been substantially completed no timing condition is appropriate.

Andrew Boughton

INSPECTOR

³ Design Guidance 2.5.of the SPD

⁴ I have nothing before me to contradict what appears to be at the root of the Council's position

⁵ Being the SPD guidance that a step in the ridgeline should be introduced where a two-storey side extension is added.