



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 February 2025

by **H Whitfield BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10 March 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/P4415/D/24/3357682

46 Haigh Court, Brampton Bierlow, Rotherham S63 6LP

- 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 Kristian Roebuck against the decision of Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is RB2024/1438.
 - The development proposed is described as “Single storey canopy extension to front elevation full width”.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of a single storey front extension at 46 Haigh Court, Brampton Bierlow, Rotherham S63 6LP in accordance with the terms of the application Ref RB2024/1438, 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 drawing nos: Location Plan, Floor Plans, Proposed Elevations and Roof Plans.
 - 3) The external materials of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing dwelling.

Preliminary Matters

2. The description of development in the banner heading above has been taken from the planning application form. However, I note the Council altered the description of development when validating the application to read “*Erection of single storey front extension*”. This description more accurately reflects the proposal and has therefore been used in my formal decision. I am satisfied that the cases of the parties would not be prejudiced by this.
3. During my site visit I observed that changes have been made to the front elevation of the appeal building which do not accord with the Existing Elevation plans before me. The mono-pitched roof over the garage and front door has been extended across the left-hand side of the front elevation across the existing bay window and a single storey side extension has been constructed. No details of these alterations have been supplied to me in evidence. Nevertheless, I have considered this appeal on the basis of the submitted plans.
4. A revised National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) was published on 12 December 2024 and corrected on 7 February 2025. I have had regard to the Framework as a material consideration in my decision making. As there are no

substantive changes relevant to the appeal before me, I have not invited further comments from the parties on this matter. I am satisfied that neither party is prejudiced by this.

Main Issue

5. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the appeal building and surrounding area.

Reasons

6. The appeal property is a two-storey detached house located in a housing estate where properties are of a similar scale and style. The building is located at the side of a turning head and is prominent on approach along Haigh Court. There is a general consistency of material palette and architectural detailing in the street scene where properties have features such as bay windows, decorative timber porch canopies and lean-to porches. However, several properties in the immediate area (including the appeal property) have been extended and altered over time, in some cases changing these features. This results in a varied character and appearance.
7. The proposal is to construct a single-storey extension across the full width of the front elevation. The extension would have a mono-pitched roof design with a gable fronted porch canopy broadly centrally over the front door. Given the limited depth and height, the extension would not be a significant or bulky addition to the dwelling. It would also utilise design features such as a porch canopy that would be similar to other properties in the surrounding area. The scale and design of the extension would not have an unbalancing effect on the property and the proposed use of matching materials would respect the design of the property and street scene, aiding its assimilation into the wider area.
8. The development would replace the bay window on the front elevation, which is discouraged by Design Guidance 2.4 (DG 2.4) of the Council's Householder Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (2020) (SPD). However, in this case, the bay windows in this estate do not feature on every property and whilst not unattractive, they do not contribute significantly to the character and appearance of this area. Furthermore, I observed during my site visit that other properties in the estate have altered their bay windows or undertaken other alterations to their principal elevations. This contributes to the overall varied character and appearance of the street scene. Therefore, the removal of the bay window as proposed in this appeal would have a neutral effect on the character and appearance of the dwelling and wider area.
9. I note the Council finds further conflict with DG 2.4 of the SPD in relation to extensions spanning across the entire frontage of properties. However, this guidance is specific to terraced and semi-detached properties and the appeal building is detached. Similarly, the Council also refers to the guidance on the maximum projection of front extensions. However, this is given in the context of preserving the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers where there are close relationships with windows, rather than for aesthetic reasons. In any event, I find no harm with the scale and proportions of the extension and how it would relate to the dwelling.
10. I accept that due to the location of the property, the proposed extension would be clearly visible from a range of viewpoints along Haigh Court. However, given the scale and design of the extension it would not appear unduly dominant or incongruous in this varied setting. Its form and detailing would generally complement the varied styles

of the other houses in the surrounding area, and it would relate well to the host dwelling. This aligns with the overarching objective of DG 2.4 of the SPD which supports front extensions that respect the character and appearance of the host property and wider area.

11. For the above reasons, I conclude the proposed extension would not harm the character and appearance of the appeal building and surrounding area. As such, it would comply with Policy CS28 of the Rotherham Local Plan Core Strategy 2013-2028 and Policy SP55 of the Rotherham Local Plan Sites and Policies (2018) which support development that is responsive to its context, is visually attractive, promotes high quality and positively contributes to the local character and distinctiveness of an area. It would also comply with the Framework where it seeks high quality design.

Conditions

12. I have considered the planning conditions suggested by the Council against the tests in the Framework and the Planning Practice Guidance. I have imposed conditions specifying the period for commencement and requiring the development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans in the interest of planning certainty. I have also imposed a condition requiring matching materials to maintain the character and appearance of the building and area.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the development accords with the development plan and the appeal should be allowed.

H Whitfield

INSPECTOR