



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 July 2024

by Paul Cooper MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23 August 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/P4415/D/24/3342678

61, Rig Drive, Swinton, Rotherham S64 8UL

- 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 & Mrs Hermoso against the decision of Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref RB2024/0159, dated 25 January 2024, was refused by notice dated 4 April 2024.
 - The development proposed is erection of additional storey above existing single storey garage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The description of development differs from the application form to the decision notice. I have no evidence to suggest that change was agreed, therefore I have used the original description. I am satisfied neither party is prejudiced by this course of action.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a brick built detached dwelling located in a predominately residential area. The general design profile in the area is of dwellings with an attached single storey flat roofed garage, but many of these have been extended and converted with appropriate roof profiles.
5. The proposed extension would add a first floor above the existing garage but still retaining the flat roof profile which contrasts with the existing profile of the existing dwelling. If constructed, the resulting dwelling would look out of place and not co-ordinate with the dwellings in the immediate locality, appearing uncharacteristically prominent in the street scene and create an uncomfortable relationship between the proposal and the existing dwelling.
6. The roof form of the proposal would appear odd in its surroundings, failing to respect the angles of the roof of the existing dwelling and its overall height, unduly detracting from the host dwelling and surrounding properties. As stated previously, other nearby properties have been altered with first floor extensions above the garage and have chosen to harmonise with the roof profile of the

existing dwelling to give an outward appearance that complements the character and appearance of the area.

7. In this instance the proposal fails to respect the character and appearance of the locality and as such, conflicts with Policies CS28 of the Rotherham Local Plan Core Strategy (2014) and saved policy SP55 of the Rotherham Local Plan Sites and Policies (2018) which, when taken as a whole, amongst other matters, expect development to be of high quality and contribute to the character and distinctiveness of an area. I also find conflict with the guidance set out in the Supplementary Planning Guidance – Householder Design Guide.

Conclusion

8. The proposal does not accord with the development plan as a whole and there are no other considerations, including the Framework, that indicate I should take a different decision other than in accordance with this.
9. For the reasons outlined above, I conclude the appeal should be dismissed.

Paul Cooper

INSPECTOR