



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 May 2025

by **K Mansell BA (Hons) MPhil TP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12 June 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/P4415/D/25/3363717

112 Laughton Road, Thurcroft, Rotherham S66 9DT

- 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 David Farrar against the decision of Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is RB2024/1420.
 - The development proposed is a carport, pergola and balcony.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. On my site visit I saw that the carport, pergola and balcony had been constructed. I have determined the appeal on that basis, noting the plans submitted with it, but altering the description accordingly.
3. The Officer Report states that because the development is retrospective, enforcement action in respect of the appeal scheme has been authorised. For the avoidance of doubt, this is a Section 78 appeal, which is concerned solely with assessing the planning merits of the proposal.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area.

Reasons

5. Laughton Road is a long thoroughfare running through an established residential area fronted by houses of different ages and styles. Whilst there is a variable building line along its length, houses are typically set back behind an open front garden or driveway that are often delineated by a wall or fence. This provides some order and consistency to the pattern of development along the road, which makes a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the area.
6. The appeal property at No 112 is a two-storey detached brick dwelling situated at the end of a shared driveway accessed from Laughton Road. This also serves three other detached houses. Its principal elevation fronts Laughton Road, from which it is set well back, separated from the highway by a public right of way and delineated by a boundary fence and vegetation. This small group of houses lies on the edge of the residential area with open farmland beyond and to the rear.

7. The appeal scheme is a raised timber balcony to the south-east facing side elevation of the appeal property, wrapping around to part of the front elevation. It is set at first floor level with supporting structures beneath it and accessed from an external staircase. A timber pergola is positioned forward of the principal elevation of No 112, in front of an existing single storey garage, and a detached gabled roof car port in front of that.
8. The balcony extends approximately 3 metres from the side elevation of the appeal property, narrowing slightly in depth to the front of the house. Whilst an open structure, this substantial elevated projection, combined with the supporting struts beneath, results in a sizeable addition. Even though the appeal property is at the end of the row of dwellings, and even if this element of the appeal scheme would be screened by mature vegetation to the boundary of No 112, it would still remain partly visible from the shared driveway. Moreover, its construction in timber does not complement the material used in the construction of the appeal property. It would consequently appear discordant and detrimental to the character and appearance of the host dwelling.
9. The pergola and carport introduce additional structures forward of the principal elevation of the appeal property. Whilst neither would extend closer to Laughton Road than the nearby built form at 1 Moorhouse Drive, I saw on my site visit that No 1 sits forward of development in the immediate vicinity, and it is the main dwelling, rather than an outbuilding, that is positioned in this location. Moreover, the carport to the appeal property in particular, due to its scale, position near the front boundary, and white UPVC-clad gables, is clearly visible above the perimeter fence from Laughton Road and conspicuous in the street scene. It is also prominent from the driveway shared with Nos 106 to 110 Laughton Road. Along with the pergola and balcony, it significantly reduces the openness at the front of the house, harming the visual and spatial quality of the street, and the scheme as a whole appears as an incongruous feature in the area.
10. I therefore find that the appeal scheme harms the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area. As such, it conflicts with Policy CS28 of the Rotherham Local Plan Core Strategy (2014) and Policy SP55 of the Rotherham Local Plan Sites and Policies (2018). These policies seek to ensure, amongst other matters, that all forms of development are designed well, are appropriate in scale and materials, and contribute to and improve the character and distinctiveness of the area. It also conflicts with guidance within the Rotherham Local Plan Householder Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (2020). This includes advice that extensions should be in matching materials and should not dominate the house by being set forward towards the street, and a presumption against garages and outbuildings in front gardens. It further fails to accord with good design aims of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Other Matters

11. My attention has been drawn to the approval of other developments in the locality, including at 33 Bawtry Road, which the appellant considers to be comparable. However, I have not been provided with full details of these planning permissions nor their history. Consequently, I cannot be certain as to the detailed considerations that applied in those cases. In any event, I am required to reach conclusions based on the individual circumstances and merits of this appeal, and my findings relate to

the scheme before me and its impact on the immediate locality, which cannot be directly comparable.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons above, the proposal conflicts with the development plan, and there are no material considerations that warrant taking a decision otherwise than in accordance with it. The appeal should therefore be dismissed.

K. Mansell

INSPECTOR