



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 November 2023

by Mark Caine BSc (Hons) MTPL MRTPI LSRA

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14 November 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/P4415/D/23/3329907

1 Marlowe Road, Herringthorpe, Rotherham S65 2JQ

- 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 Haywood against the decision of Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref RB2023/1003, dated 19 July 2023, was refused by notice dated 7 September 2023.
 - The development proposed is described as 'retrospective application for boundary fencing'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. The development applied for has been carried out.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The appeal site is situated on a corner location next to the prominent junction of Marlowe Road, Swinburne Place and Stevenson Drive. Although slightly diluted by some boundary walls and fences, the prevailing character of the surrounding estate roads is of dwellings that are laid out in a linear pattern with their front garden areas enclosed by hedgerows and shrubbery. These combine with trees and grass highway verges to present a soft edge to the built environment.
5. It is uncontested that the development has replaced a front hedge. Its length, height and prominent siting, along with the solid concrete pillar, post and timber materials has introduced an unduly robust and dominant feature that appears conspicuous and visually unsympathetic in the context of the prevailing softly landscaped character of the surrounding area. Due to its corner location, the discordant nature of the development is readily apparent from along Marlowe Road, Stevenson Drive and from several neighbouring properties. The staining of the timber panels would not overcome this harm.
6. I have also not been provided with the full details of the circumstances that led to the variety of boundary treatments in the immediate vicinity being accepted. On the evidence presented I therefore cannot be certain that they represent a direct parallel to the development. In any event, those that I saw of a similar

height to the development served to confirm that they have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the surrounding area. I therefore do not consider their presence to be a reason for justifying further harm.

7. Accordingly, I find that the development causes unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the area. It thereby conflicts with Policy CS 28 of the Rotherham Local Plan Core Strategy 2013-2028 (2014) and Policy SP 55 of the Rotherham Local Plan Sites and Policies (2018). These require the design of development to be high quality, to reinforce and complement local distinctiveness and take all opportunities to improve the character and quality of an area.
8. The development also fails to accord with advice within the Council's Householder Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (2020) and the design objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) in these respects.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given above, having taken account of the development plan as a whole, along with all other relevant material considerations, the appeal should therefore be dismissed.

Mark Caine

INSPECTOR