



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 March 2025 by L Clark MSc MRTPI

Decision by John Morrison BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23rd April 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/P4415/D/25/3360164

4 Union Street, Harthill, Rotherham S26 7YH

- 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 Nick Jessop against the decision of Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is RB2024/1781.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a single storey front lounge and en-suite extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single storey front lounge and en-suite extension at 4 Union Street, Harthill, Rotherham S26 7YH in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref RB2024/1781 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 numbers 23.005.2 and 23.005.4 Rev B.
 - 3) The external materials of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing dwelling.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Preliminary Matter and Main Issue

3. The description above is taken from the application form which differs slightly from the decision notice. However, this has not changed anything fundamental nor prejudiced the ability of any party to make their case in respect of the appeal scheme. The main issue in which is whether the proposed development would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Harthill Conservation Area (HCA).

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal site is a detached property constructed from stone and set back from the roadside. It is bordered by a stone wall and neat hedging that provides a substantial level of screening to the front. There is a detached outbuilding where the side gable forms part of the front boundary. The area that surrounds the appeal

site is populated by other dwellings of different forms, many of which are located immediately alongside the highway or behind stone walls. These factors combine to create a narrow street pattern with a pleasant sense of traditionality.

5. The proposal would extend forward of the existing dwelling but would be tucked behind the existing boundary treatments that would partly screen the extended part from view. Nevertheless, and even if the boundary treatments were not in place, the proposed extension would not have a dominant presence within the street scene and would be subordinate to the dwelling itself. This is due to the small scale of the development and the distance that it would still be stepped back. The existing garage forms part of the front boundary and roadside gables are not uncommon within the street scene therefore the projection forward would not be at odds with the surrounding development. Combining the size of the proposal with the matching materials proposed, the development would be reflective of the character and appearance of the area and consistent with the established pattern.
6. Section 72 (1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 states special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area. Paragraph 212 of The National Planning Policy Framework 2024 places emphasis on great weight being given to the asset's conservation. Given the assessment above, the proposal would ensure that both the character and appearance of the HCA would be preserved. It would therefore comply with Policies CS23 and CS28 of the Rotherham Local Plan Core Strategy 2014 and Policies SP41 and SP55 of the Rotherham Local Plan Sites and Policies 2018. These are concerned with proposals conserving heritage significance and being responsive to their context amongst other things.

Conditions

7. Other than the standard time limit condition, it is necessary to ensure that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans for certainty and enforcement purposes. In the interests of the character and appearance of the area, a condition relating to materials to match those used in the existing dwelling is also necessary.

Conclusion and Recommendation

8. For the reasons given above, the appeal scheme would comply with the development plan. I therefore recommend the appeal be allowed, subject to the conditions mentioned.

L Clark

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

9. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is allowed, subject to the conditions set out above.

John Morrison

INSPECTOR