
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 31 January 2022

by David Fitzsimon MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21 February 2022.

Appeal Ref: APP/P4415/D/21/3288677
81 Broom Road, Broom, Rotherham S60 2SW

- 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 Umar Farouq against the decision of Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref RB2021/1916, dated 5 October 2021, was refused by notice dated 30 November 2021.
 - The development proposed is a ground floor extension to front of existing dwelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a ground floor extension to front of existing dwelling at 81 Broom Road, Broom, Rotherham S60 2SW, in accordance with the terms of application, Ref. RB2021/1916, dated 5 October 2021, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with Drawing Number EC36 03 Rev A.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the street scene within which it sits.

Reasons

3. The appeal relates to a detached dwelling. It sits on a busy main road that is home to dwellings of a wide variety of designs and sizes. The proposal seeks to add a modest single storey extension with a mono-pitch roof to the front of the property. It would be set in slightly from each side, but would span the majority of its frontage, projecting about 2 metres forward of the principal elevation.
-

4. The Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Document titled '*Householder Design Guide*' (SPD) explains that front extensions are eye catching and can significantly alter the appearance of a building. It goes on to say that in general, bay windows should be retained and on terraced and semi-detached properties, single storey extensions that extend across the entire frontage will normally be refused. It adds that front extensions should not harm the character and appearance of the host property or be of a design (that is) out of keeping with others in the street.
5. Whilst the SPD suggests that front extensions that span the full width of terraced or semi-detached properties should be refused, the appeal dwelling is detached. Furthermore, the SPD advises that *in general*, bay windows should be retained. This suggests to me that there will be instances where their loss is acceptable and this should be carefully assessed on an individual basis, taking site specific circumstances and context into account.
6. The appeal dwelling is of a fairly standard design and neither it nor the rectangular bay window which is scheduled for removal are of any particular architectural merit. The proposed extension would be of modest depth whilst its door and window proportioning and positioning would sit comfortably against the first floor window arrangement of the host dwelling. As a result, I am satisfied that the proposed extension would not harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling.
7. The appeal dwelling is set back a reasonable distance from the highway and it is not particularly prominent within the street scene. As the Council has accepted, this part of Broom Road is home to houses of a variety of sizes and styles. At my visit, I noticed a broadly similar single storey projecting section, albeit with a hipped roof to match that of the host dwelling, just four dwellings along Broom Road in the north-west direction. There has been no suggestion that this example is unlawful. These factors lead me to the view that the proposal would not harm the character or appearance of the street scene either.
8. For the above reasons, I conclude that the development proposed would not harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling or the street scene within which it sits. In such terms, I find no conflict with the overall aims of policies CS28 and SP55 of the adopted Rotherham Local Plan or the SPD.
9. In addition to the standard conditions which limit the lifespan of the planning permission and direct that the development takes place in accordance with the approved plans, the Council has suggested one other condition in the event the appeal succeeds. I agree that the external finishing materials of the extension should match those of the host dwelling in order to ensure a visually acceptable development.
10. In allowing the appeal, I shall impose conditions accordingly.

David Fitzsimon

INSPECTOR