



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 July 2024 by Andreea Spataru BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

Decision by A M Nilsson BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12 September 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/P4415/D/24/3344434

89 Woodfoot Road, Moorgate, Rotherham S60 3EH

- 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 Asif Ali against the decision of Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application reference is RB2023/1342.
 - The development proposed is for the erection of two storey side and rear extension, single storey side and rear extensions and conversion of existing garage, alterations to ground levels and alterations to roof.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Preliminary Matter

3. The description of development above has been taken from the Council's Decision Notice and the Appeal Form, as it more accurately describes the appeal scheme than the description outlined on the Application Form.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the street scene.

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. The appeal property is a detached, two-storey dwelling located on the western side of Woodfoot Road, within a residential area. Most of the properties on Woodfoot Road, including the appeal property, are set back from the road, and have single storey elements to the side, most of them serving as garages. The open spaces above the single storey elements provides a pleasant degree of openness between the properties and prevents the buildings from appearing cramped in their plots.
 6. The land level increases slightly from the south to the north of the road. For most of the dwellings, particularly on the western side of the road, there is a clear separation and hierarchy in terms of ridge height, as the dwelling to the north appears higher than its adjoining one to the south. Thus, the siting of the
-

dwellings in relation to the road, the gaps and 'steps' between them provide a simple and pleasing rhythm to the road. This makes a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the street scene.

7. Policy CS 28 of the Rotherham Local Plan Core Strategy 2014 (CS) and Policy SP 55 of the Rotherham Local Plan Sites and Policies 2018 (LP) require that new developments are responsive to their context and positively contribute to the local character and distinctiveness of an area. The Householder Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document 2020 (SPD) refers specifically to extensions and indicates that, amongst other things, they should be subservient to their host dwelling.
8. The proposal, particularly because of the introduction of the two-storey element to the side coupled with the alterations to the roof, would add substantial mass and bulk to the original dwelling. As a result, it would significantly alter the proportions of the host dwelling and would fail to appear subservient to it. Due to its height, overall massing, and sitting next to the northern boundary of the appeal site, the additions and alterations would result in a development that appears cramped in its plot. Consequently, the development would be an incongruous addition, which would significantly reduce the openness to the side of the dwelling and affect the rhythm of the properties along Woodfoot Road. The resultant dwelling would not respond positively to the slope of the road as is the case with the current dwelling.
9. Due to the incline of the road and the space around the property, its southern elevation is exposed and clearly visible. The increase in height of the southern elevation when combined with the increase in the angle of the roof-slope would make this clearly visible and prominent elevation appear highly dominant in the street-scene. Even if the overall height of the dwelling would only be marginally increased, the development would represent a considerable increase in its overall bulk and massing.
10. The remaining garden space to the rear and the matching materials are not sufficient to mitigate the impact of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the street scene.
11. I acknowledge the examples provided by the appellant regarding other neighbouring properties and their extensions, and I have observed on my site visit that some dwellings have been extended to various degrees. However, although some dwellings have been extensively altered, they do not define the general character of the street scene as set out above. Some of the examples also serve to demonstrate the harm that can be caused to the character and appearance of the area by inappropriate extensions. I also note that in the case on the adjoining property to the south, No 87 Woodfoot Road, a degree of openness has been maintained to its northern side.
12. In any event, I have considered the development on its own individual planning merits and site-specific circumstances. Accordingly, the alterations made to the adjoining properties do not justify allowing harmful development, which fails to make a positive contribution to the street scene.
13. In light of the above, I conclude that the proposal would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the street scene. Accordingly, the development would conflict with the aims of Policies CS 28 of the CS and SP 55 of the LP, as set out above. It would also be contrary to the

guidance outlined within the SPD and to the aims of the National Planning Policy Framework (2023) in terms of ensuring high quality design in developments.

Other Matters

14. I acknowledge that the appellant has sought to overcome the Council's reason for refusal of a previous planning application¹ at the property by reducing the size of the extension. Whilst the approach is commendable, I have however determined this appeal on its own planning merits and have found that there would be harm caused despite a reduction in size from the previously refused scheme.
15. I acknowledge that the development would provide additional living accommodation for the occupants of the property. Such personal circumstances, however, seldom outweigh general planning considerations and I therefore give them limited weight in the appeal.
16. I also note the economic, social, and environmental benefits outlined by the appellant. Given the scale of the proposal, these benefits are limited and thus not sufficient to outweigh the harm identified above.

Recommendation

17. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

Andreea Spataru

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

18. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's recommendation and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

A M Nilsson

INSPECTOR

¹ LPA ref: RB2023/0514