



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 April 2025

by **P Eggleton BSc(Hons) MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 06 May 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/P4415/D/25/3363010

89 Woodfoot Road, Moorgate, Rotherham S60 3EH

- 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 Asif Ali against the decision of Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application reference is RB2024/1600.
 - The development proposed is a side and rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a side and rear extension at 89 Woodfoot Road, Moorgate, Rotherham, South Yorkshire in accordance with the terms of the application, reference RB2024/1600, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Location Plan, Block/Site Plan, Floor Plans 4B and 6B and Elevations 5B.
 - 3) The works hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the description of materials set out in the application form.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The proposal would extend this property to the side and rear; and result in the re-ordering of its windows and associated internal accommodation. The design proposed would appear as a two storey side extension. Although relatively wide at first floor height, it would remain of a subservient width when compared to the main frontage of the dwelling. The hipped roof, the slightly lower ridge height and the step back from the frontage, would help to reduce its perceived scale and prominence. The council accept that it would generally meet the specific design requirements set out in their Supplementary Planning Document - Householder Design Guide 2020.
4. The council's concern relates to the relationship with the neighbouring property and the loss of space between dwellings. The proposal would result in development close to the boundary and the lesser width of the first floor element would not

provide a significant gap to the neighbouring property. The hipped roof would however reduce the perceived scale of the first floor element in close proximity to the boundary. The neighbouring property is set at a higher level and with the proposal in place, there would be a substantial step down from the ridge and eaves of that property. In these circumstances, these two houses would not appear as a terrace given the changes in levels, heights and roof designs. The gap between them would be eroded but given the existing dominance of the neighbouring dwelling, particularly when viewed from the south, this would not result in significant harm to the existing relationship. The area is not entirely uniform with regard to the design or spacing of dwellings. The proposed arrangement would not materially alter the overall character, in this regard, to its detriment.

5. Comparative plans have been provided with regard to a previous appeal, APP/P4415/D/24/3344434, which was dismissed. It is evident that the details have changed significantly. The hipped roof and the clear distinction between built elements, resulting from the step back of the first floor in particular, results in a more satisfactory and better proportioned design. These changes are sufficient to address the concerns previously raised. Whilst there are relationships locally that have relatively similar designs and result in the closing of the gap between houses, the resultant harm would not be repeated in relation to this proposal given the design modifications and the levels differences. In any event, this proposal must be considered on its own merits.
6. I have had regard to the concerns raised by local residents. Given the changes in levels and the dominance of the adjacent property, the gap that would be reduced does not provide the level of perceived openness that is found between some other properties. As described previously, the design changes help to maintain a distinction between this dwelling and its neighbour, to the extent that the character of the area would not be harmed and the dwelling would not appear cramped within the plot. The hierarchy of roof heights would also be maintained. Overall, the revised proposal would be of a high quality design and it would not detract from the character or appearance of the area. It would not therefore be at odds with the design requirements of policy CS 28 of the Core Strategy 2014 or policy SP 55 of the Sites and Policies Local Plan document 2018. It similarly does not conflict with the design objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework 2024. I therefore allow the appeal.
7. I have imposed conditions relating to the commencement of development and the details of the approved plans for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning. The application form sets out the details of the materials to be used and a condition would require that these details are implemented to ensure that the development would have a satisfactory appearance.

Peter Eggleton

INSPECTOR