



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: 12 June 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/P4415/D/25/3359610

8 Windsor Road, Thorpe Hesley, Rotherham S61 2QS

- 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 Alan Bamford against the decision of Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application No is RB2024/1226.
 - The development proposed comprises first floor front and side extensions.
-

Decision

1. For the reasons that follow, the appeal is dismissed insofar as it relates to the first floor extension to the front and associated alterations to the existing porch.
2. However, the appeal is allowed in relation to the remainder of the development and planning permission is granted for a first floor extension to the side of 8 Windsor Road, Thorpe Hesley, Rotherham, in accordance with the terms of the application, RB2024/1226, 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 description of development set out above is taken from the Council's Decision Notice as a more accurate description of what is proposed than that on the application form, which refers to two-storey extensions.

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.

Reasons for the Decision

5. No 8 Windsor Road lies within an established residential estate. It comprises a two-storey detached dwelling in a row of five detached properties of the same original design, each presenting a gabled front to the road, with the ridge running front to back. Like its neighbours, it has a garage to the side that projects forward of the house slightly, wrapping part way across the frontage to create a porch area. The porch at No 8 has previously been extended to the side and has been brought forward of the garage. It is proposed to erect a first-floor extension to the side of the house, above the existing garage. It is also proposed to further widen the porch and to erect a first-floor extension above.
6. The Council's Householder Design Guide indicates that two-storey side extensions should generally be set back at least 0.3 metres at first floor level on the front

elevation, with the roof set down from the main body of the house, and should be no more than half the width of the original house.¹ Although no more than half the width of the main house, the side extension proposed would be flush with the front wall of the house and the ridge would be the same height as the original dwelling. There would be conflict, in this regard, with the advice in the Design Guide.

7. However, I saw that No 10 Windsor Road, the immediately adjacent property to the northwest, has a first-floor extension to the side that is flush with the original front wall and is not set down from the ridge - exactly the same as is currently proposed for No 8. It would also be the same as No 23 on the opposite side of Windsor Road. I do not know whether those extensions pre-date the Design Guidance or not, but even if they do, they have not resulted in harm to the street scene or the established character and appearance of the area.
8. I recognise that the first-floor side extensions to some of the other properties opposite (eg Nos 25, 27 and 37) are set back very slightly from the front elevation, but there is no obvious step down in ridge height. Again, even if those extensions pre-date the current Guidance, their design has not resulted in any harm to the character and appearance of the area.
9. Notwithstanding that the side extension proposed is not set back from the front elevation, with no step down in ridge height, it would match the corresponding extension on the adjacent property and at least one on the opposite side of the road. I am also mindful that for those properties where there is a slight set back at first floor level (albeit with no step down in ridge height) it is so marginal as to be barely noticeable. In my view, given that context, the first-floor side extension proposed would not be seen as disproportionate in size or form and would not be seen as unduly prominent or discordant in any way. It would not detract from the host property and there would be no material harm to the character or appearance of the area. There would be no conflict, in this regard, with policy CS28 of the Rotherham Local Plan Core Strategy (2014) or with policy SP55 of the Rotherham Local Plan Sites and Policies (June 2018), which together and among other things promote high quality, well-designed buildings that respond to their context and are visually attractive. There would be no conflict either, with the thrust of the Design Guidance, which aims to ensure that extensions make a positive contribution to the local environment and do not detract from the host property and the street scene.
10. In relation to front extensions, the Design Guide states that they are eye catching and can significantly alter the appearance of a building, advising that they should not harm the character and appearance of the host property, or be of a design that is out of character with the street.
11. The proposed first-floor front extension would project 1.4m from the front of the house, with a width of some 3.4m, effectively creating a two-storey gabled bay projection on the front of the property. It would comprise a dominant and intrusive structure that would be seen as an incongruous addition to the street scene here, relating poorly to its surroundings, particularly since the only projecting elements to the front of this run of five, largely identical properties, are the single-storey, slightly projecting garages and associated porches. There would be material harm in this regard to the established character and appearance of the area.

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

12. In support of the appeal, my attention was drawn to a similar extension to the front of No 29, on the opposite side of Windsor Road. The Council confirms that the extension, constructed in 1992, pre-dates the advice in the Design Guide. In my view, it is an unexpected and disruptive feature in the street scene, interrupting views along the street where the only other projecting elements are the modest garage and porches at ground floor level. Its presence is not good reason to allow a further, similarly disruptive extension at the appeal property.
13. The harm that I have identified would be a consequence of the front extension would bring the scheme into conflict with development plan policies CS28 and SP55, and with Design guidance 2.4 of the Householder Design Guide, which together promote high quality, well-designed buildings that respond to their context and are visually attractive. There would be conflict too with paragraph 135 of the recently revised National Planning Policy Framework, which requires, among other things, that new development adds to the overall quality of an area, is visually attractive and sympathetic to local character.

Overall Conclusion and Planning Balance

14. For the reasons set out above, the proposed first-floor extension to the front, and associated alterations to the 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 front extension and porch alterations are clearly severable from the rest of the scheme. On that basis, I conclude that the appeal should succeed in relation to the first-floor side extension.
15. In terms of conditions, in addition to the standard time limit on the commencement of development and the clarification of plans, which is necessary in order to create certainty for all, it is necessary to ensure that the external materials match those on the existing dwelling in the interest of visual amenity.

Jennifer A Vyse
INSPECTOR

SCHEDULE OF CONDITIONS

APP/P4415/D/25/3359610

8 Windsor Road, Thorpe Hesley, Rotherham S61 2QS

- 1) The development hereby permitted, namely a first-floor side extension, 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 first-floor side extension hereby permitted). No permission is either granted or implied for the first-floor front extension and associated porch alterations shown on those plans.

Existing/ Proposed Plans/Elevations - 2423/001

Location Plan - 2423/002

Site Plan - 2423/003

- 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the first-floor side extension hereby permitted shall match those used on the existing building.

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