

**PLANNING BOARD**  
**27th April, 2023**

Present:- Councillor Atkin (in the Chair); Councillors Andrews, Bacon, Ball, Bird, Burnett, Cowen, Elliott, Fisher, Havard, Keenan, Tarmey and Taylor.

The webcast of the Planning Meeting can be viewed at:-  
<https://rotherham.public-i.tv/core/portal/home>

**185. EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC**

There were no items on the agenda to warrant exclusion of the press and public.

**186. TO DETERMINE ANY ITEMS WHICH THE CHAIRMAN IS OF THE OPINION SHOULD BE CONSIDERED AS A MATTER OF URGENCY.**

There were no matters of urgency for consideration.

**187. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Councillor Ball declared a disclosable personal interest in RB2022/1806 (Increase in height of part of building from two to three storeys to create apartments with two additional apartments in the roof space at Phoenix Court, 67 Blyth Road, Maltby) on the grounds that he had objected to the application prior to becoming a Planning Board Member.

**188. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 6TH APRIL, 2023**

**Resolved:-** That the minutes of the previous meeting of the Planning Regulatory Board held on Thursday, 6<sup>th</sup> April, 2023, be approved as a correct record of the meeting.

**189. DEFERMENTS/SITE VISITS**

**Resolved:-** That application RB2022/1806 (Increase in height of part of the building from two to three storeys to create apartments with two additional apartments in the roof space at Phoenix Court, 67 Blyth Road, Maltby) be deferred to the next meeting to ensure appropriate documentation is circulated to all objectors.

**190. DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS**

**Resolved:-** (1) That, on the development proposals now considered, the requisite notices be issued and be made available on the Council's website and that the time limits specified in Sections 91 and 92 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 apply.

In accordance with the right to speak procedure the following people attended the meeting and spoke about the application below:-

- Reserved matters application (details of scale, external appearance, landscaping and layout) for the erection of 456 dwellinghouses and floorspace within Use Class E (Commercial, Business and Service) (reserved by outline RB2022/1076) at Waverley New Community off High Field Spring, Catcliffe for Barratt David Wilson Homes (RB2022/1275)

Mr. M. Jones (Applicant)  
Mrs. T. Paterson (Objector)

(2) That the reserved matters application RB2022/1275 be granted for the reasons adopted by Members at the meeting and subject to the relevant conditions listed in the submitted report.

## 191. UPDATES

The following update was provided:-

Further to Minute No. 118 of the meeting of the Planning Board held on 11th August, 2022 consideration was given to the appeal outcome following refusal of planning permission for the demolition of 2 No. bungalows and erection of 8 No. flats at 2 Goose Lane, Wickersley for Habbin Ltd. (RB2021/0401).

In allowing the appeal the Inspector commented:-

*“The appeal site is on a prominent corner plot. The Wickersley Design Code supports the Wickersley Neighbourhood Plan 2021 – 2028 and is referenced in Policy GP1 in relation to securing high quality design. It is not disputed that the most relevant character area from the WDC is Character Area 6 which is characterised by a mixture of property types with material and architectural styles varying throughout. The WDC continues that the variety of building types results in the area lacking a distinctive and coherent set of key dimensions. Also of relevance to the appeal site is guidance in the WDC which sets out that key corners and junctions should be marked by ‘gateway units’ that are different in scale and materiality to those forming the main streets. Houses on these corners should be designed in such a way that both aspects facing the street provide visual interest and window openings.*

*In wrapping around the corner plot the proposal would have a different built form to the neighbouring properties and it would introduce a different but complementary palate of materials, including red brick and stonework, which would ensure the scheme integrates with its local context. It would be forward of the main elevations of neighbouring properties on Goose Lane and Bawtry Road. Nevertheless, the scheme would still be set back from the road, would retain the traditional stone wall, and taking account*

*of its corner location would create a 'gateway unit'. In doing so it would emphasise the site's key location at a junction and contribute to a legible hierarchy of buildings and spaces in the locality."*

In addressing the matter of overdevelopment, he went on to state:-

*"It has been suggested that the appeal scheme would represent overdevelopment of the site, however, owing to the large plot size the spacing and layout of the proposal is acceptable. The proposal would result in a clear sense of integration in the immediate street scene and wider area and would not be incongruous or visually intrusive. The proposal would also be punctuated by windows at regular intervals, providing visual interest and an active and animated elevation, in line with the guidance within the WDC.*

*The Council suggest that the guidance for corner plots in the WDC is not relevant to the appeal scheme, which should instead take account of the existing building lines and the built form in the area, and the massing of one of the neighbouring properties which is single storey. However, I have no clear reason not to take this aspect of the WDC into account, alongside the other relevant aspects of the WDC."*

Following an application for costs the Inspector confirmed:-

*"the planning officer's report to planning board concluded that the proposal would be acceptable in design, scale and appearance, taking the opportunity to provide a key corner building. Yet little evidence was then put forward by the Council to support the reason for refusal to establish why the proposal would be an excessive form of development that would appear visually intrusive. In particular it has not been clearly articulated as to why the appeal scheme should not be treated as a gateway site given its prominent corner location.*

*In the planning judgement, it appears to me that having regard to the provisions of the development plan, national planning policy and other relevant considerations, the development proposed should reasonably have been permitted. The refusal of planning permission therefore constitutes unreasonable behaviour contrary to the guidance in the National Planning Policy Framework and the PPG and the appellant has been faced with the unnecessary expense of lodging the appeal."*

**Resolved:-** That the information be received and the content noted.

**192. DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

**Resolved:-** That the next meeting of the Planning Board take place on Thursday, 18<sup>th</sup> May 2023 at 9.00 a.m. at Rotherham Town Hall.