



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 April 2024

by D Cleary MTCP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 09.05.2024

Appeal Ref: APP/P4415/D/24/3337513

14 Coach Road, Greasbrough, Rotherham S61 4ED

- 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 Jeanette Wareham against the decision of Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref: RB2023/1149, dated 23 August 2023, was refused by notice dated 02 November 2023.
 - The development proposed is described as a single storey outbuilding to front.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. In the banner above, I have used the description of development from the decision notice instead of the planning application form. This describes the development more concisely.
3. At the time of my site visit the construction of an outbuilding at the site had commenced and, with the exception of finishing materials, was largely complete. I have determined the appeal on the basis of the submitted plans.
4. Since the decision was made by the Council, a revised version of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) was published (19 December 2023). This does not materially change the planning policy context in respect of the main issue.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

6. The appeal dwelling is a two-storey end terraced, located in a group of three properties. The dwellings are set back from Coach Road, with gardens to front. A tall coniferous hedge is positioned along part of the Coach Road frontage. The side boundary adjacent to the access to a converted annex consists of a stone wall with tall fencing above. The boundaries to the front of No's 10 and 12 Coach Road (No's 10 and 12) consist of low-level walls and hedging. The surrounding area is predominantly residential in character comprising a mix in design and form, while there is some variety in the building line. A large open

playing field is located on the opposite side of Coach Road. Within the immediate area outbuildings and garages are generally discretely positioned to the side or rear of their dwelling.

7. The outbuilding occupies part of the front garden and is positioned wholly forward of the front building line of the dwelling. The siting of the building brings development much closer to Coach Road, resulting in an anomaly in the building line, which erodes the established pattern of development in the area.
8. The roof of the building has a very shallow pitch and sits below the height of the coniferous hedge to the front. This hedge, along with the tall fencing to one side, screens the building from the playing fields opposite, and in views down Coach Road, from the junction with Green Street. However, the low boundaries to the front of No's 10 and 12 means that the development is exposed in views from the lower parts of Coach Road and the public land at the junction with Croft Street. From these vantage points, the outbuilding appears significantly forward of the existing dwelling resulting in a prominent addition within the street scene, that appears out of context with its surroundings.
9. It is acknowledged that the use of stone facing materials would result in an appearance which would harmonise with the dwelling. However, the use of materials would not address the harm arising from the development by virtue of its prominent siting forward of the building line. Furthermore, it is not considered that the construction of an additional fence across the front garden would act as sufficient screening to make the development acceptable. Such fencing would add to the visual clutter to the front of the property, and would erode the existing open frontages created by low-level boundaries.
10. Therefore, the outbuilding has a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area. The development is contrary to Policies CS28 and SP55 of the Rotherham Local Plan Core Strategy 2014; and the Framework. Together, amongst other things, these require development to be of high-quality design. The development is also contrary to the Householder Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (2020) which seeks to resist the construction of garages and outbuildings in front gardens.

Other matters

11. I note that the garage would provide essential storage which has been lost through the conversion of the previous garage to an annex. I also note that the building stores medical equipment for an elderly and disabled relative. These are 'protected characteristics' embraced by the public sector equality duty under s149 of the Equality Act 2010. While I am sympathetic to the appellant in this regard, I am not persuaded that the outbuilding, as sited, is the only viable location, or the only feasible solution, to provide such storage. Therefore, I can only attach moderate weight in favour of a development which would improve the quality of life for its occupants. I consider that this benefit does not outweigh the harm that the development would cause in relation to the main issue, which is significant. Therefore, it is proportionate and necessary to dismiss the appeal.

Conclusion

12. For the above reasons the appeal is dismissed.

D Cleary

INSPECTOR