



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 January 2025

by **J D Clark BA (Hons) DpTRP MCD DMS MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11 February 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/P4415/D/24/3349270

2 Almond Glade, Wickersley, Rotherham S66 1JZ

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant approval required under Article 3(1) and Schedule 2, Part 1, Class AA of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended).
 - The appeal is made by Mr & Mrs Raza against the decision of Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is RB2024/0578.
 - The development proposed is erection of additional storey to existing single storey dwelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. Under Article 3(1) and Schedule 2, Part 1, Class AA of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 as amended (the GPDO), planning permission is granted for the enlargement of a dwellinghouse by the construction of additional storeys subject to limitations and conditions.
3. Paragraph AA.3.(12) of the GPDO requires the local planning authority to (a) take into account any representations made to them and (b) have regard to the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) in so far as relevant to the subject matter of the prior approval, as if the application were a planning application. My determination of the appeal has been made on the same basis.
4. The reason for refusal cites The Wickersley Neighbourhood Plan (adopted May 2022), the Council's Householder Design Guide (Supplementary Planning Document, adopted June 2020) and the Framework. The principle of development is established through the grant of permission by the GPDO, and I am required to assess the proposal as a prior approval application as set out within the parameters of the GPDO. Regard can be given to development plan policies insofar as they are material considerations, however they are not in themselves determinative.
5. A revised version of the Framework was published in December 2024 and is a material consideration in this appeal. Having considered the revisions to the Framework, as well as the principles of natural justice, together with the nature of the determining issues in this appeal it is clear to me that there are no material changes in the revised Framework relevant to the substance of this appeal. Therefore, I do not consider it necessary, in this instance, to invite any submissions from the parties on the revised Framework.

Main Issue

6. There is no dispute regarding the limitations set out in paragraph AA.1. Consequently, the main issues are the effect of the additional storey on the external appearance of the dwellinghouse, including the design and architectural features of the principal elevation of the dwellinghouse (AA.2(3)(a)(ii)(aa)).

Reasons

7. The appeal site comprises a detached bungalow and its gardens located towards the end of a narrow lane. Almond Glade serves three properties, No 1 is two storeys high (a dormer bungalow) whilst Nos 2 and 3 are both single storey. Almond Glade is a cul-de-sac.
8. Floor plans of the existing bungalow or the proposed additional storey have not been submitted with the appeal plans but the elevations have. From these the additional storey would extend upwards over most of the ground floor, with the exception of a garage. This part of the dwelling would remain single storey.
9. The existing bungalow lacks any particular architectural merit but it is a low level building that sits well within this small enclave of buildings and their narrow access lane. It is large but as it is single storey it does not appear intrusive or dominant in its setting. Adding a storey, as proposed, would change that. The principal elevation of the resulting dwelling would appear as a large and dominant building. Its bulk and massing would be at odds with the low key character of the street scene. Furthermore, whilst the simple design of the existing bungalow is unobtrusive, increasing the height of the dwelling in such a bland manner would appear incongruous and poorly designed. The fact that Almond Glade is a cul-de-sac and therefore is not viewed by general passers-by does not make a insensitively designed development acceptable but would conflict with the design objectives set out in Section 12 of the Framework.
10. Consequently, the additional storey would have a harmful effect on the external appearance of the dwellinghouse, including the design and architectural features of the principal elevation of the dwellinghouse (AA.2(3)(a)(ii)(aa)).

Other Matters

11. Paragraph AA.2 (3)(a)(i) requires decisions for prior approval to take into account the impact on the amenity of any adjoining premises including overlooking, privacy and loss of light.
12. There are residential properties to the rear of the appeal site which are on a lower level and therefore the occupiers of these houses would have a clear view of the enlarged property. However, given the distance between No 2 Almond Glade and its neighbours to the rear, there would not be any loss of light. There would be some overlooking but for the same reason, any loss of privacy would be limited and unlikely to cause undue harm to the neighbours living conditions. Likewise, those in the dwellings on the opposite side of Almond Glade would experience a negligible impact on their living conditions.
13. The appellant has drawn my attention to other large houses in the area and whilst I cannot dispute their presence, the characteristics of their locations differ from those here. Furthermore, although described as substantial in size there is no suggestion that their design is the same as that proposed here. Therefore, they

are not directly comparable. Consequently, the other matters raised do not alter my findings on the main issue in this appeal.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons given above the appeal should be dismissed.

J D Clark

INSPECTOR