



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 April 2025

by **P Eggleton BSc(Hons) MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 06 May 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/P4415/D/25/3361773

6 Goldcrest Walk, Thorpe Hesley, Rotherham S61 2TS

- 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 Mike Denby against the decision of Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application reference is RB2024/1483.
 - The development proposed is a two storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a two storey side extension at 6 Goldcrest Walk, Thorpe Hesley, Rotherham in accordance with the terms of the application, reference RB2024/1483, and the plans submitted with it, 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 the following approved plans: Location Plan, Block Plan and 37/24/Y20-01a.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces shall match those of the existing dwelling.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The proposal would result in a side extension to this dwelling. It would be set back from the frontage and would be relatively narrow, compared to the front facing gable of this relatively modern property. It would be of a design and materials that would reflect the detailing of the main house. Although close to the side boundary and stepped to maximise the floorspace, it would remain subservient to the main form of the dwelling and would be in keeping with its design.
4. The property has already been extended to the other side, with a larger addition, that similarly follows the design detailing of the original house. Although in combination these two extensions would substantially increase the overall mass of the property and alter its form, each element would be of a satisfactory design and scale when considered separately. The forward facing gable would remain a dominant feature that would continue to contribute to the existing character of the

area. I am not persuaded that when taken together, the two extensions would result in harm to the character or appearance of the dwelling or the wider area. The works would not therefore be at odds with the design requirements of policy CS 28 of the Core Strategy 2014 or policy SP 55 of the Sites and Policies Local Plan document 2018. The set back, width and design appear to follow the requirements of the Supplementary Planning Document - Householder Design Guide 2020. I find no conflict with the design requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework 2024.

5. Overall, I have found nothing to suggest that the proposal should not be supported. I therefore allow the appeal.
6. I have imposed conditions relating to the commencement of development and the details of the approved plans for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning. The application form sets out that the materials would match and a condition to require this would be necessary to ensure that the development would have a satisfactory appearance.

Peter Eggleton

INSPECTOR