



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 April 2024

by F Rafiq BSc (Hons) MCD MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 08 May 2024.

Appeal Ref: APP/P4415/D/24/3337268

76 Gildingwells Road, Woodsetts, Rotherham S81 8QP

- 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 and Mrs Smith against the decision of Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is RB2023/1543.
 - The development proposed is a front boundary wall and automatic roller gate.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a detached dwelling, which like other neighbouring buildings, is set back from the road behind front garden and parking areas. These are generally enclosed by various forms of boundary treatment, although in the vicinity of the appeal site, low boundary walls, some of which combine with railings above or those that are wholly formed of hedging predominate. The presence of low boundary walls and hedges to frontages, the planting within gardens, as well as views over open areas of land on the opposite side of Gildingwells Road, gives the area a spacious, semi-rural character.
4. The proposed boundary treatment would extend to a height of around 1.8m along the site's frontage. Although the brick piers provide a linkage with the walls to the fronts of neighbouring properties at 74 and 78 Gildingwells Road, the piers proposed on the appeal property would be taller than those to either side.
5. The appeal property has been extended and renovated with a contemporary finish. The proposed boundary treatment, which would include rendered panels, seeks to compliment the works undertaken on the dwelling. Its height would however limit views into the appeal property's front garden and parking areas which would erode the spacious character of the area. Whilst there are a variety of boundary treatments in the wider local area, the proposal more immediately, would be seen in the context of neighbouring properties, where it would appear as an incongruous, dominant addition.

6. I therefore conclude, for the reasons set out, that the appeal proposal would have a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the area. It would therefore conflict with Policy CS 28 of the Rotherham Local Plan Core Strategy 2013-2028 and Policy SP 55 of the Rotherham Local Plan Sites and Policies, which seek, amongst other matters, high quality development and design that takes all opportunities to improve the character and quality of an area. It would also conflict with paragraph 135 of the National Planning Policy Framework and the Householder Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document, which require development to be sympathetic to local character.

Other Matter

7. I note the benefits the proposal would provide in terms of security, and whilst this matter weighs in favour of the proposal, it would not outweigh the harm that I have identified to the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

8. For the reasons given above, having considered the development plan as a whole, the approach in the Framework, and all other relevant material considerations, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

F Rafiq

INSPECTOR