



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 November 2023

by Ian McHugh DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 2ND February 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/P4415/D/23/3329946

48 Ramsden Road, Moorgate, Rotherham, S60 2QW

- 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 Abdul Ghani against the decision of Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref RB2023/0729, dated 22 May 2023, was refused by notice dated 27 July 2023.
 - The development proposed is two storey rear and side extensions and loft conversion.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The description of the development given in the banner heading above is taken from the planning application form. This differs from the Council's description in its decision notice, which describes the proposal as two storey side and rear extensions with rooms in the roof space and single storey rear extensions. I consider the Council's description to be accurate and, therefore, I have considered the appeal on this basis.
3. Since the appeal was lodged, a revised version of the National Planning Policy Framework (The Framework) was published in December 2023. I am satisfied that the revised version has no bearing on the main issues for this appeal.

Main Issues

4. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of both the existing dwelling and the streetscene; and the effect of the proposal on the living conditions of the occupants of number 50 Ramsden Road (number 50), with regard to outlook and natural light.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

5. The appeal property is a semi-detached, two storey dwelling, which is situated in the urban area. House types along Ramsden Road vary in terms of their age and appearance and the gaps between properties also vary in width. However, these gaps provide some relief in what is densely developed area.
6. The proposal is to construct extensions as described in paragraph 2 above. The side extension would cover the width of the existing driveway and its front

wall would be level with the main front wall of the existing dwelling. It would also have a gabled roof which contrasts with the existing hipped roof structure.

7. Although the existing narrow driveway at number 50 would ensure a physical separation between the appeal property and the neighbouring dwelling, I consider that the mass and scale of the proposed extension, together with the reduced gap between the dwellings, would be overly dominant and harmful to the character and appearance of both the existing property and the streetscene. Accordingly, it would conflict with Policies CS28 and SP55 of the adopted Rotherham Local Plan Core Strategy 2013-2028, which generally seek (amongst other things) to ensure that development responds to local character and is visually attractive.

Living Conditions

8. At present both the appeal dwelling and the neighbouring property at number 50 are separated by two narrow driveways. The driveway at number 50 leads to a detached garage in its rear garden. Number 50 has main windows facing towards its rear garden and there are also four small windows on its side elevation facing the appeal property. Three of these windows appear to be obscure glazed with the other being a secondary kitchen window.
9. The proposed appeal extension would be positioned on the north-eastern side of number 50 and given this orientation and the difference in ground levels (with number 50 being higher), I am not persuaded that the proposal would result in any significant loss of natural light.
10. However, notwithstanding the presence of the existing garage at number 50 and the difference in levels, I consider that the close proximity of the extension, coupled with its height and mass would have an unacceptably overbearing effect on the dwelling at number 50 and its garden. Although the policies of the LP quoted by the Council in its decision notice do not refer to outlook, paragraph 135 of The Framework states (amongst other things) that planning decisions should create places with a high standard of amenity. I consider that the proposal conflicts with this requirement.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above, it is concluded that the appeal be dismissed.

Ian McHugh

INSPECTOR