



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 April 2024

by D Cleary MTCP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13th May 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/P4415/D/24/3337822

17 Manor Road, Wales, Rotherham S26 5PD

- 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 Matthew Plant against the decision of Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref: RB2023/1627, dated 21 November 2023, was refused by notice dated 12 January 2024.
 - The development proposed is described as the erection of a detached garage.
-

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 a building at the site had commenced but was incomplete. I have considered the appeal on the basis of the submitted plans.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

5. The appeal site is a detached dwelling located within ribbon development along Manor Road. The surrounding area is predominantly residential in nature comprising of dwellings of varied design. The building line along Manor Road is generally varied, although Nos. 15 – 21 Manor Road (Nos. 15 – 21), are set back a significant distance from the public highway and have a more uniformed building line. This set back, plot widths and absence of tall boundary treatment, result in the frontages to this group of dwellings having a general sense of openness. Along Manor Road, there are a number of garages which are sited to the front of their properties.
6. The garage has a large footprint and is proposed to have a shallow, hipped roof design. The garage is positioned within the front curtilage, some distance from the dwelling itself or other built form. The siting of the garage appears visually

disconnected from the dwelling and other buildings in the area. The close proximity of the development to the Manor Road, and distance from other buildings, is such that the building appears prominent in the streetscene. Some views of garage along Manor Road are obscured by existing buildings or landscaping. However, the frontages of Nos.19 and 21 are open and the garage is viewed across these frontages. This context exacerbates the detachment and prominence of the building which results in an erosion of the open character of the frontages.

7. The garage is positioned a similar distance from Manor Road as No.11a. However, the garage is separated from this property by the frontage of No.15. This separation means the built and visual context of the garage is Nos. 15-21, rather than 11a. As observed above, these properties are set back from the highway and have open and spacious frontages, which the garage erodes.
8. The detached garage to the front of No.15 is set back a greater distance from Manor Road than the appeal building. In addition, it is positioned behind the building line of No.11a by some distance, and appears closely related to existing built form. As such that garage does not appear prominent. Other garages along Manor Road are also closely related to other built form and, as such, I do not find them to be directly comparable to the appeal proposals.
9. I acknowledge that the scale of the building has been reduced from that previously considered at appeal¹ and, as such, the overall effect on the character and appearance of the area would be reduced to some degree. However, it is understood that the siting and footprint of the building remains the same to that previously considered. As observed by the previous Inspector, the "garage is prominently located to the front of the appeal property". As I have observed above, I find the proximity to Manor Road, and distance from other buildings to result in a prominent and harmful form of development. In any event, I have considered the revised appeal proposals on its individual merits.
10. I accept that the effect of the development could be softened through landscaping and a 2m high hawthorn hedge has been proposed along the Manor Road frontage. However, as identified by the previous Inspector, landscaping should not be relied upon to screen an otherwise unacceptable form of development. In any event, the landscaping proposed would only partially screen or soften the development from the front. No landscaping is proposed along the side boundary and prominent views of the development across the frontages of Nos. 19 and 21 would remain. The example of screening cited at South Anston² also appears to be contextually different and as such does not have a significant bearing on my conclusions.
11. Therefore, the garage 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 National Planning Policy 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

¹ APP/P4415/D/23/3328762

² Appeal Statement – Appendix 1

the construction of garages in front gardens, unless it is demonstrated that no harm to the street scene will occur.

Conclusion

12. For the above reasons the appeal is dismissed.

D Cleary

INSPECTOR