
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 May 2024

by C Skelly BA (Hons) MSc MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12 June 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/P4415/D/24/3340190

12 Meadow Croft, Swinton, Rotherham S64 8EL

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Windle against the decision of Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is RB2023/1757.
 - The development proposed is a side extension above garage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. I note that an original objection from the neighbour at 10 Meadowcroft has now been withdrawn.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and its surroundings, including the street scene.

Reasons

4. The site is located in a residential cul-de sac, comprising of five brick-built, two-storey detached houses. The properties within the cul-de-sac are of different styles, arranged in a repeated pattern, which extends across adjacent streets providing a cohesive appearance to the surrounding area. The rooflines of the houses in the cul-de-sac gradually step downwards reflecting the topography. The front elevation of 12 Meadowcroft is also stepped back from that of No 14. As a consequence of these factors No 12 is not particularly prominent in the wider street scene.
5. The principal elevation of No 12 is gable fronted whilst at first floor level there is a recessed cross gable. A pitched roof covers the garage and front door, the apex of which aligns with the lefthand side of the front gable where it meets the recessed cross gable. This roof line arrangement projects forward from the principal elevation of No 12 making it a prominent feature of the property. Together with its simple architecture, this gives the property a well-balanced and proportionate appearance.
6. The proposed extension would increase the height of the garage to provide additional living accommodation at first-floor level. It would incorporate a new

gable that projects forwards of the principal gable, albeit the footprint of the property would remain the same.

7. The proposed extension would alter the existing roofline arrangement. Its ridge height would be lower than that of the principal gable elevation. However, together with its forward projection, the extension would result in an awkward conglomeration of competing roof forms that would unbalance the property and erode one of its key features. Accordingly, despite the use of similar materials to the existing, the proposed gable design and the loss of simple configuration of the pitched roof would harm the character and appearance of the host property.
8. While No 12 is set back from the street, the proposal would disrupt the overall pattern of development in the wider street scene and surrounding area. Hence, it would appear conspicuous when viewed alongside other properties causing harm to the character and appearance of the cul-de-sac.
9. The appellant has referenced a similar extension at 5 Raven Meadows. On my site visit I also noted the extension to No 1. However, neither of these properties are of the same style of the host property having the very prominent garage/front door roof design. I have therefore assessed the proposal on its own merits and concluded that it would cause harm for the reasons outlined.
10. For the reasons outlined, I conclude that the proposed development would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host property and its surroundings including the street scene. The proposal therefore conflicts with the aims of Policies of the three different parts of the Rotherham Local Plan before me, namely Policy CS28 of the Core Strategy (2014), Policy SP55 of the Sites and Policies Document (2018) and the Householder Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (2020) which seek to ensure that extensions are of high-quality design, allow the original building to remain dominant and to contribute positively to the character of the local area. The proposed development would also be contrary to the requirements of good design as set out in paragraphs 131 and 139 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Other Matters

11. I note that the proposal seeks to support the growing needs of the family. The proposal would not cause harm to the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers by reason of overshadowing. Nonetheless these circumstances do not provide sufficient justification to outweigh the harm identified above.
12. The appellant's appeal statement has also referred to the conduct and advice of the Council during the determination of the planning application process. However, these are not matters for my deliberation in the context of an appeal.

Conclusion

13. The proposal conflicts with the development plan and the material considerations do not indicate that the appeal should be decided other than in accordance with it. For the reasons outlined above the appeal is dismissed.

C Skelly

INSPECTOR