



Appeal Decision

Site visit carried out on 10 April 2025

by **Jennifer Vyse DipTP MRTPI DipPBM**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25 April 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/P4415/D/25/3360377

404, Bawtry Road, Hellaby, Rotherham S66 8EX

- 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 Tony Duke against the decision of Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application No is RB2024/1751.
 - The development proposed comprises a two-storey side extension, single storey rear extension and front elevation re-design, including a porch.
-

Decision

1. For the reasons that follow, the appeal is dismissed insofar as it relates to the erection of the porch.
2. However, the appeal is allowed in relation to the remainder of the development and planning permission is granted for a two-storey side extension, single-storey rear extension, and redesign of the front elevation at 404, Bawtry Road, Hellaby, Rotherham, in accordance with the terms of the application, No RB2024/1751, and the plans submitted with it (so far as they are relevant to that part of the development hereby permitted), subject to the conditions set out in the attached schedule.

Procedural Matter

3. The grounds of appeal include concerns with how the planning application was dealt with by the Council. However, those concerns do not relate to the planning merits of the case and are not a matter for me in determination of this appeal. Any ongoing concerns in this regard should be pursued with the Council in the first instance.

Main Issue

4. The main issue in this case relates to the effect of the development proposed on the character and appearance of the area, and its effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of No 402 Bawtry Road, having particular regard to daylight and outlook.

Reasons for the Decision

Character and Appearance

5. The appeal property comprises one half of a pair of traditionally designed, two-storey semi-detached dwellings. Mirroring its adjoining neighbour (No 406), it has a two-storey mock half-timber gable to the front (adjacent to the party wall) with the eaves to the front of the remaining part of the roof extending down to roughly front door level. Both properties have a hipped roof to the

side. Surrounding properties generally comprise semi-detached dwellings of varying architectural styles, although there are some detached properties, including No 402. All the properties on this stretch of the road are set behind generous front gardens.

6. It is proposed to erect an open sided timber-framed porch area to the front of the property, set on a brickwork plinth, together with a two-storey extension to the side, that would extend beyond the rear wall of the house to roughly the same depth as an existing, single storey lean-to at the rear, which would be demolished to allow for the erection of a single storey extension across the rear of the property. The extension would project beyond, and wrap around behind, the proposed two-storey extension.
7. The single-storey extension would be flat roofed and clad in timber. No issue is taken in relation to its design in terms of any impact on the character and appearance. I have no reason to disagree, its location at the rear of the property meaning that it is not seen in public views.
8. Among other things, the Council's Householder Design Guide¹ requires that extensions should be subsidiary to the existing dwelling, allowing the original dwelling to remain dominant. In order to prevent two-storey side extensions from unbalancing a pair of semi-detached properties, they should be no more than half the width of the existing dwelling, set back behind the building line of the property by at least 0.3 metres at first floor level, with a lower roof line. In addition, the roof style should reflect that of the host property.²
9. Although the proposed two-storey side extension would project forward of the low roof slope at the front of the property (as does the existing gable), it would be set 0.3 metres behind the line of the existing front wall, eaves and gable. The existing low roof slope on the western (right hand) half of the dwelling would be retained. Moreover, far from doubling the width of the existing house, as asserted by the Council, the extension would be approximately half the existing width.
10. Whilst the ridge to the new section of roof linking the proposed extension to the existing roof would be the same height as the existing ridge, the apex of the proposed gable would sit some 0.35 metres below the ridge, with the pitched roof to the side elevation repeated.³ Reflecting the existing materials, the extension, would be rendered to the side and rear elevations, with a half-timbered gable and brickwork at the front. All told, I find no material conflict with the advice in the Council's Guide and consider that the design of the extension, which draws on distinguishing features of the appeal property and its neighbour, respects the traditional architectural style of the existing buildings. I find no harm to the character and appearance of the area in this regard.
11. The Council is also concerned that the extension would 'unbalance' this pair of dwellings. The first thing to note is that the advice in the Design Guide is specifically intended to ensure that extensions such as this do not unbalance a pair of semis. That advice has been followed. Moreover, the neighbouring property, No 406, has already undergone modifications, including the addition of a large box

¹ Rotherham Local Plan Householder Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (adopted June 2020)

² Design Guidance 1.2, 1.6 and 2.5

³ Although the submitted plans show the existing gable as the same height as the existing ridge, I saw that both the existing gables (at 404 and 406) sit below the ridge.

dormer across the rear that clearly impacts the side elevation as seen from the street. In any event, this is not a street where the pairs of semi-detached dwellings are of the same, or similar, repeated design. Rather, there is variety. I saw one pair of completely different design to any others, being much taller, with rooms in the roof space and dormers to the front elevation. Another pair, Nos 28 and 30 each have two storey extensions to the side but of very different designs. Closer to home, No 408 has a two-storey extension to the side, whereas its adjoining neighbour has not been similarly extended. Unlike the appeal proposal, that extension is not set back from the building frontage and it has a ridge the same height as the original dwelling. No 416 is another property with a two-storey extension to the side where its adjoining neighbour does not. In that case, the extension is set back slightly behind the original front wall, with a slight step down in the ridge height.

12. Whilst the latter examples mean that those pairs of dwellings are no longer symmetrical, they do not, to my mind, appear overtly unbalanced. Nor are they harmful to the character and appearance of the area in any way. Given that context, I consider that the proposed two-storey side extension would not be seen as overly dominant in its setting, or as an incongruous addition. It would sit comfortably on the plot and would not unacceptably affect the overall balance of this semi-detached pair. Again, I find no harm, in this regard, to the established character and appearance of the area.
13. Objections are also raised to the proposed porch area to the front. I saw that the majority of single storey extensions to the front of other properties in the vicinity are of brick and are enclosed, with a lean-to style tiled roof that generally runs parallel to the ridge of the main house. The proposed porch would be a sizeable structure, almost half the width of the existing property, extending out from the front of the dwelling, presenting an open gable end with exposed rustic timber supports. It does not reflect the architectural style or materials of the host property. As a consequence, it would be seen as an incongruous and obtrusive feature in the street scene.
14. To conclude on this issue, I find the majority of the development proposed to be acceptable having regard to its impact on the character and appearance of the area. There would be no conflict in this regard with the provisions of policy CS28 of the Rotherham Local Plan Core Strategy (2014), with policy SP55 of the Rotherham Local Plan Sites and Policies (June 2018) or the Householder Design Guide SPD, which together and among other things promote high quality, well-designed buildings that respond to their context and are visually attractive.
15. However, the harm that would be a consequence of the proposed porch conflicts with those same policies, and with Design Guidance 2 of the Design Guide. There would also be conflict with paragraphs 135a) b) and c) of the recently revised National Planning Policy Framework, which require that new development should add to the overall quality of an area, and is visually attractive and sympathetic to local character.

Living Conditions for Adjoining Occupiers

16. The Council takes no issue with the proposed porch to the front, the entirety of the two storey side extension, or the majority of the single storey extension in terms of

any impacts on the living conditions of adjoining occupiers. From what I saw during my site visit, I have no reason to disagree.

17. Concern is raised though, in relation to that part of the single-storey extension proposed which would extend behind the proposed two storey extension. That part of the development would be around 6.3 metres beyond the rear facing wall of the adjacent property to the west, No 402, which wall contains a window to a habitable room at ground floor level. Technically, that would breach advice in the Authority's Householder Design Guide to the effect that single-storey rear extensions should project no more than 4 metres beyond the existing rear elevation of a neighbouring property.⁴
18. However, an existing detached, single storey garage to the rear of No 404 sits adjacent to the shared boundary with No 402. It is at a slightly lower level than, but adjoins a similar garage set to the rear of No 402, which garage extends further forward than the one at 404. The proposed single-storey extension would have no different relationship with No 402 than does the existing garage (the front part of which would be replaced by the proposed extension). In any event, the nearest part of the extension to the boundary would be screened from the adjacent property by the existing garage at No 402. That is clearly demonstrated on Plan No 10-PPA-ZZ-00-DR-A-0400 RevA.
19. Accordingly, notwithstanding the technical breach of the Guidelines, there would be no actual harm in terms of outlook or loss of daylight for the adjoining occupiers at No 402 as a consequence of the single-storey extension proposed. There would be no conflict, therefore, with policies CS28 and SP55, which together and among other things seek to protect such interests. There would be no conflict either, with paragraph 135f) of the Framework, which encourages a high standard of amenity for existing and future users.

Overall Conclusion and Planning Balance

20. For the reasons set out above, the proposed porch would cause material harm to the established character and appearance of the area. I conclude, therefore, that the appeal should not succeed in relation to this element of the proposals. However, I have found the remainder of the scheme to be acceptable. It seems to me that the porch is clearly severable from the rest of the development. On that basis, I conclude that the appeal should succeed in relation to the remainder of the development proposed.
21. In terms of conditions, in addition to the standard time limit on the commencement of development and clarification of the plans, which is necessary in order to create certainty for all, details of external materials are required in the interest of visual amenity.

Jennifer A Vyse
INSPECTOR

⁴ Design Guidance 2.2

SCHEDULE OF CONDITIONS

APP/P4415/D/25/3360377

404 Bawtry Road, Hellaby, Rotherham S66 8EX

- 1) The development hereby permitted, namely a two-storey side extension, a single-storey rear extension, and redesign of the front elevation, shall begin no later than three years from the date of this decision.
- 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans (but only insofar as they relate to the two-storey side extension, the single-storey rear extension, and redesign of the front elevation hereby permitted). No permission is either granted or implied for the porch shown on those plans.

Existing Plans and Elevations	Dwg No 010-PPA-ZZ-00-DR-A-0001
Site and Location Plan	Dwg No 010-PPA-ZZ-00-DR-A-0400 Rev A
Proposed Plans	Dwg No 010-PPA-ZZ-00-DR-A-0401 Rev A
Proposed Elevations	Dwg No 010-PPA-ZZ-00-DR-A-0402 Rev A
Proposed 3D Views	Dwg No 010-PPA-ZZ-00-DR-A-0403 Rev A

- 3) No development shall take place until details/samples of all external materials for the two-storey side extension, the single-storey rear extension, and redesign of the front elevation hereby permitted, have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

-----End of Conditions Schedule-----