



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 May 2025

by **L Wilson BA (Hons) MA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 9 June 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/P4415/W/25/3360284

34 Rig Drive, Swinton, Rotherham S64 8UN

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a grant of planning permission subject to conditions.
 - The appeal is made by Craig Edwards against the decision of Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref RB2024/1526 was approved on 6 December 2024 and planning permission was granted subject to conditions.
 - The development permitted is erection of rear dormer and soil vent pipe.
 - The condition in dispute is No 2 which states that: Within three months from the date of this decision, the following works shall be fully implemented.
The materials used in the external surfaces of the rear dormer window extension hereby approved shall be altered to be of a similar appearance to those used in the construction of the existing roof and shall be in accordance with the details provided in the submitted application form/shown on drawing no AES-0672-11-REV1.
The approved works shall thereafter be retained and maintained.
 - The reason given for the condition is: In order to ensure a satisfactory appearance in the interests of visual amenity.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Background and Main Issue

2. Retrospective planning permission was granted at 34 Rig Drive for a rear flat roof dormer and soil vent. The appellant wishes to retain the existing dormer cladding, thus seeks to remove condition 2 which relates to the materials of the dormer. I have no reason to disagree with the conclusions reached by the Council in respect of all other issues relating to the determination of the planning application.
3. Therefore, the main issue is the effect that removing condition 2 would have on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area.

Reasons

4. No 34 is a semi-detached dwelling located in a residential area. The appellant has drawn my attention to other dormers in the locality and cladding. In general, these use darker cladding which is of a similar colour to the roof or relate to smaller dormers with pitched roofs and matching roof tiles. The examples therefore are not directly comparable to the case before me. Furthermore, I do not have the full details of these cases, and I have considered the appeal proposal on its own merits.
5. On my site visit I observed that whilst there were examples of dwellings with dormer windows to the rear elevation, they were not a common feature in the

locality. The external surface of the rear facing dormer windows I saw were largely of a similar colour to the roof tiles and the colour did not draw the eye.

6. No 34's dormer window is large and covers a substantial proportion of the rear roof. Given that the dormer is located to the rear, it is not visible from Rig Drive (including the garage and parking area to the side). However, it is visible from Darwynn Avenue.
7. The Council has provided copies of Policy SP 55 of the Rotherham Local Plan: Sites and Policies (2018) and Policy CS 28 of the Rotherham Local Plan: Core Strategy 2013-2028. These collectively seek, amongst other things, to ensure developments are of high quality and use appropriate materials. Furthermore, the Council's Householder Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (2020) (SPD) states that the use of UPVC cladding will accentuate the appearance of a dormer.
8. The cladding is a very light grey and therefore contrasts with the colour of the roof, and accentuates the appearance of the large dormer. Thus, when viewed from the highway between Nos 15 and 17 Darwynn Avenue, the external surface appears stark and draws the eye which detracts from the character and appearance of the host dwelling and area. Consequently, the cladding results in an unsatisfactory appearance that is not sympathetic to the host dwelling or surrounding area.
9. I sympathise with the appellant that it would be costly to paint or replace the dormer safely. Furthermore, I recognise that the dormer is not higher than the original roof ridge, and there is a reasonable distance between the dormer and 15 Darwynn Avenue. However, these considerations do not outweigh the harm that I have found.
10. For these reasons, removing condition 2 would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area, and is necessary to ensure a satisfactory appearance. It therefore would conflict Policies SP 55 and CS 28 as well as the aims of the SPD.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above, the proposal conflicts with the development plan and the material considerations do not indicate that the appeal should be decided other than in accordance with it. Consequently, the appeal does not succeed.

L Wilson

INSPECTOR