
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 March 2022

by R Jones BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 29 April 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/P4415/D/21/3289730

4 View Tree Close, Harley, Rotherham S62 7UT

- 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 Garth Bradwell against the decision of Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref RB2021/1773, dated 4 September 2021, was refused by notice dated 18 November 2021.
 - The development proposed is a single storey front extension incorporating a new entrance and an extension to the living room at ground floor level.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single storey front extension incorporating a new entrance and an extension to the living room at ground floor level at 4 View Tree Close, Harley, Rotherham S62 7UT in accordance with the terms of the application, RB2021/1773, dated 4 September 2021, and the plans submitted with it, 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 the following approved plans: Existing Floor Plans – Sheet 1 (drawing ref. 122-101-02); Existing Elevations (drawing ref. 122-301-02); Proposed Floor Plans – Sheet 1 (drawing ref. 122-121-03); Proposed Floor Plans – Sheet 2 (drawing ref. 122-122-03); and Proposed Elevations (drawing ref. 122-321-03).
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Preliminary Matter

2. The address given on the planning application form and the Council's decision notice is 4 Viewtree Close, whereas the appeal form and drawings give it as 4 View Tree Close. I have used the latter in the banner heading above as this reflects the street sign I observed on site.

Main Issues

3. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed extension on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and street scene.

Reasons

4. No.4 View Tree Close (No.4) is a detached two-storey dwelling situated close to the entrance of View Tree Close, a small cul-de-sac off Harley Road. It is one of a group of three dwellings that are similar in design with facing gable elements, finished in mid-red brick with dressed stone quoins, lintels and window surrounds.
5. The Council's *Householder Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document* (June 2020) (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 that front extensions should not harm the character and appearance of the host property or be of a design out of keeping with others in the street. No.4 has an L-shaped plan with a steep gable projection to a double garage with dormer windows above (to the side roofslope). It is proposed to remove the existing bay to the living room and extend to the front of the dwelling projecting around 3.6m (excluding the bay) along the side elevation of the garage, with a shallow pitched roof. Although this would reduce the projection of the garage from the main elevation of the dwelling, the overall appearance of the front elevation would not significantly alter and the characteristic gable, with side dormers would remain.
6. The SPD also states that the amenities of neighbouring property should be considered and any front extension should project no more than 2m. The proposed projection of 3.6m, or around 3m if you include the existing bay window, would clearly be in excess of the SPD guidance. However, the first part of the guidance suggests its purpose is to protect the amenities of neighbours rather than be a blanket restriction on any front extension exceeding 2m. Further, the SPD guidance it just that and each application proposal falls to be considered on an individual basis, taking site specific context into account. In this case, the proposed extension would project no further forward than the existing garage or the building line of the group of three houses. The depth of the projection would not appear at all alien or dominate the host dwelling and it would not therefore cause harm to the character or appearance of the street scene.
7. I note that the existing bay would be removed and the window to the extension would be flush with the front elevation. The SPD advises that *in general*, bay windows should be retained but this suggests to me that there will be instances where their loss is acceptable. The neighbouring dwellings on View Tree Close are bungalows, of uniform design with front bay windows. However, neither of the other two dwellings within the group of three that No.4 forms part have bay windows on their front elevation. It is not a defining characteristic of the dwelling or street scene and therefore the loss of the bay is acceptable in this case.
8. For the above reasons, I conclude that the development proposed would not cause harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling or the street scene. Consequently, it accords with Policy CS28 of the Rotherham Local Plan Core Strategy 2013-2028 (September 2014) because it is responsive to its

context and would be visually attractive as a result of good architecture. It would also accord with the guidance at paragraph 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework which requires development to be sympathetic to local character.

Conditions

9. In addition to the standard condition which limits the lifespan of the planning permission, for certainty, it is necessary to attach a condition that the development takes place in accordance with the approved plans. It is also necessary that the external finishing materials of the extension should match those of the host dwelling in order to ensure a visually acceptable development.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above, the appeal should be allowed.

R. Jones

INSPECTOR