



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 September 2021

by Paul Cooper MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21 September 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/P4415/D/21/3275007

1 Goose Lane, Wickersley, Rotherham S66 1JN

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Phillip Dagless against the decision of Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref RB2021/0148, dated 17 January 2021, was refused by notice dated 29 March 2021.
 - The development proposed is detached garage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The host dwelling is a semi-detached dwelling in a predominately residential area with some commercial properties in the vicinity. It is located close to the busy A631 Bawtry Road.
4. The appeal proposal shows a detached single garage to be built on a piece of land to the side of the host dwelling, measuring approximately 6m x 5m with an overall height of approximately 4m. It would be of stone fronted construction with render to the other sides and a tiled roof.
5. That side of Goose Lane is characterised by mature dwellings of traditional design set back from the highway. With established front boundary treatments, the road has a pleasant suburban character and appearance with built development counterbalanced by landscaping.
6. It is a feature of this section of road that garage extensions at the sides of properties do not extend beyond the front building line to any great degree. Similarly, there are no detached garages located in front of the dwellings. The proposed garage would dominate the house and obscure views of the dwelling to the detriment of the character and appearance of the property and this section of Goose Lane.
7. The proposal would consist of a single garage which would take up a good percentage of the side garden area, removing the spacious character of the area and introducing further built form. Whilst attempts have been made to reduce the appearance of the proposed garage, it would have an awkward and

discordant appearance when seen within this particular group of dwellings. The removal of the open space would also be detrimental to the spacious quality of the street scene which is a positive characteristic.

8. I find that the garage in that location would look extremely prominent and incongruous within the locality, effectively creating a structure that would look somewhat isolated in the area and would cause harm to the ordered pattern of development, causing material harm to the character and appearance of the locality.
9. I have noted the appellants suggestion of landscape screening in an attempt to mitigate the impact, but this will take time to settle and grow. I consider that the effect on the character and appearance of the area would be greater than any potential mitigation proposals of this nature.
10. As a result, I find the proposal is in conflict with Policies CS28 and SP55 of the Rotherham Local Plan Core Strategy (2014) and the Rotherham Local Plan Sites and Policies (2018) respectively, which expect development to be responsive to their context and address the setting of the site and the grain of surrounding development. In addition, I also find conflict with the guidance set out in the 'Householder Design Guide' Supplementary Planning Document.

Other Matters

11. I have noted the Appellants concern regarding the commercial car dealership on the opposite side of the A631 Bawtry Road, but that is a commercial development, and would have been assessed under the appropriate part of the Local Plan accordingly. I have been supplied with no details regarding that scheme. If there is a complaint regarding the lighting of those premises, then it should be taken up with the appropriate authority.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal is dismissed.

Paul Cooper

INSPECTOR