



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 July 2024

by A Berry MTCP (Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 2 August 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/P4415/D/24/3344923

289 Brinsworth Road, Brinsworth, Rotherham S60 5EL

- 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 Richard Hodkins against the decision of Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is RB2024/0115.
 - The development proposed is a ground floor and first floor side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The appellant has clarified that their surname within the planning application form was spelt incorrectly. Consequently, the name in the banner heading above contains the correct spelling.
3. The extension has been erected and therefore I am considering this appeal retrospectively.
4. The Council amended the description of development from that shown in the banner heading above to *"two-storey side and single storey front extension at 289 Brinsworth Road, Brinsworth"*. I am not aware that the appellant agreed to this change. While the elevation drawing includes a single storey extension, this is not shown on the ground floor plan and has not been constructed. Therefore, I am determining the appeal on the basis of the appellant's original description of development.

Main Issue

5. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Reasons

6. The appeal property comprises a two-storey detached dwelling with a hipped roof that is set back from the road by a front garden/off-street parking area. It is located on a residential street that contains a mix of bungalows, detached and semi-detached properties. However, each property type is grouped together in a row. Consequently, the appeal site forms part of a row of detached dwellings constructed of a similar design. However, their uniformity has been partially eroded by the construction of extensions.

7. The development comprises a two-storey side extension. The Council's Householder Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document adopted 2020 (SPD) states that two-storey side extensions should generally be set back by a minimum of 0.3m at first floor level on the front elevation, with the roof set down and back from the main body of the house. The next sentence goes on to state, *"This is in order to create a subservient extension and to prevent it unbalancing a pair of semi-detached properties"*. The second part of the sentence is not applicable to the proposal as the dwelling is detached. However, the requirement for an extension to be subservient is applicable to all dwellings, as supported by the illustrations that follow.
8. The two-storey extension is flush with the dwelling's original front elevation, and it has been tied into the original roof so that it forms one large roof across the whole of the dwelling. The extension is not subservient to the original dwelling and therefore, it has a dominant appearance that harms the host dwelling's character and appearance and appears prominent from the road.
9. During my site visit I witnessed two other two-storey side extensions that have been constructed on the detached dwellings within the row that have a similar appearance as the host dwelling. However, they are set back from the front elevation, and in the case of the example with a hipped roof, it has been set down and back from the main body of the house in accordance with the SPD. These examples are subservient to the main body of the dwelling and are not prominent from the road. Consequently, the development appears incongruous with the row of similar two-storey detached properties.
10. The appellant asserts that there are numerous examples of two-storey side extensions in the locality that are not set back or set down from the original dwelling. I have been provided with a photograph of 345 Brinsworth Road to demonstrate the appellant's assertion which I was able to view on my site visit. I am unaware of the planning history of No 345 or indeed whether planning permission was granted for the extensions. Notwithstanding this, the property is located some distance from the appeal site whereby the character and appearance of the surrounding area differs. Consequently, it is not directly comparable to the appeal proposal. In any event, I must determine each case on its own merits.
11. Planning permission¹ has been granted for a two-storey extension to the host dwelling which is a genuine fallback should I dismiss this appeal. However, the elevation drawing² shows that the two-storey side extension would be set back from the front elevation and the roof would be set down and back in accordance with the SPD. The fallback position would therefore not harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling or the surrounding area. Consequently, the fallback is preferable to the development as built.
12. In reference to the main issue, the development harms the character and appearance of the surrounding area. It conflicts with Policies CS28 and SP55 of the Rotherham Local Plan Core Strategy 2013-2028, adopted 2014 which, amongst other things, require development to be responsive to their context and be visually attractive as a result of good architecture, and reinforce and complement local distinctiveness and create a positive sense of place. It would

¹ Planning Ref RB2022/0124

² Drawing Number 747.18 Rev B

also conflict with the SPD, the National Planning Policy Framework and the Planning Practice Guidance.

Other Matters

13. As previously discussed, there are discrepancies between the elevation, floor plan and site plan drawings. However, as I am dismissing the appeal, I do not need to consider this matter further.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons given above, having regard to the development plan as a whole and all other material considerations, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

A Berry

INSPECTOR