

APPEAL STATEMENT

APPELLANT: Matthew Reynolds

ADDRESS: 135 Broadwater, Bolton upon Dearne, Rotherham, S63 8ER

LPA REF: 2025/0708

PROPOSAL: Erection of detached outbuilding in garden of dwelling

DATE OF REFUSAL: 6 October 2025

1. INTRODUCTION

This statement supports an appeal against the refusal of planning permission for a detached outbuilding at 135 Broadwater. I have lived at this property for 14 years and have designed the proposal carefully to sit comfortably within its corner plot while supporting the long-term needs of my family.

The Council refused permission for a single reason relating to *visual impact only*.

The Officer's Report confirms that the proposal causes **no harm to amenity, privacy, daylight, overshadowing, or highway safety** and that no neighbour objections were received.

The sole matter for the Inspector is therefore whether the outbuilding appears visually harmful when seen in its context. I respectfully submit that it does not.

2. REASON FOR REFUSAL AND SUMMARY RESPONSE

The refusal states that the outbuilding, being forward of the dwelling and near the road, would appear as an *incongruous and dominant feature* out of keeping with the street scene.

In response:

- The building sits fully **behind an established boundary** that has existed for decades.
 - The corner has always contained a **large visual mass**, historically a 3 m-high hedge.
 - The proposal is **subordinate in height** to the house, **screened** by fencing, and **aligned** with existing plot geometry.
 - Two other nearby corner plots on Broadwater already contain **large, visible outbuildings**, establishing local precedent.
 - No physical or perceptual harm to the public realm arises; the development instead brings **improved order, visibility, and safety** to the junction.
-

3. POLICY CONTEXT

Local Plan GD1 – General Development

Requires compatibility with surroundings and avoidance of harm.

✓ The Officer's Report confirms there is no harm to amenity or highways, so the proposal complies.

Local Plan D1 – High-Quality Design and Place-Making

Seeks design that respects context and reinforces local character.

✓ The outbuilding will be rendered to match the host dwelling, sits behind the boundary, and responds to the established corner form.

✓ It contributes positively to street coherence through durable, well-maintained design.

SPD – House Extensions and Other Domestic Alterations

States that "*in most cases*" outbuildings should not be between a house and the road.

✓ That wording anticipates exceptions where site context allows.

135 Broadwater is a **large corner plot** where development behind a historic boundary line can be visually acceptable.

✓ The building's siting and treatment achieve the SPD's aim of sympathetic, proportionate design.

NPPF §§ 134–135 – Good Design

National policy directs that development which adds to an area's quality and causes *no demonstrable harm* should be approved.

✓ This outbuilding replaces an overgrown hedge with a coherent, well-finished structure, improving the visual environment and safety at a busy junction.

4. VISUAL IMPACT AND CHARACTER

The outbuilding is visible, but **visibility is not harm**.

It occupies a generous corner plot and is read as part of the boundary composition, not as an isolated or intrusive structure.

Key facts:

- Fully **behind the boundary fence** and **0.2 m lower than the former hedge height**.
- **3 m total height**, subordinate to the dwelling's ridgeline.
- **No projection** into the public highway; sightlines remain clear.
- **Improved legibility** of the corner since hedge removal — safer for pedestrians and drivers on this heavily used route serving the Hallam Flats and the Ingsfield Lane cut-through.
- **Precedent**: Two nearby corner plots feature comparable outbuildings forward of their dwellings.

Taken together, these demonstrate a consistent pattern of built form along Broadwater.

The proposal therefore aligns with — rather than undermines — the established character.

5. NO HARM (CONFIRMED BY THE COUNCIL)

The Council's own Officer stated:

"The proposal is not expected to cause any undue overshadowing... acceptable in terms of residential amenity in compliance with Policies GD1 and D1."

That professional finding carries significant weight.

With no harm to amenity or highways and only a subjective view of design, policy balance favours approval.

6. PERSONAL AND FUNCTIONAL CONTEXT

At 6 ft 6 in tall and with previous injuries, I require a 3 m internal height to move and exercise safely.

The structure also stores family bikes and outdoor equipment.

Its design is practical, proportionate, and permanent — reflecting a genuine functional need rather than overdevelopment.

Neighbors have expressed strong support and gratitude for the improvement to what was formerly an overgrown, hazardous corner. Local residents have expressed clear support for the development, noting that the removal of the overgrown hedge and the introduction of a well-maintained boundary and structure have made the corner cleaner, safer, and more visually coherent. Written statements from adjoining neighbors confirming this support have been included with this appeal. Their lived experience of the site reinforces that this project enhances rather than harms the street scene.

7. FENCE CLARIFICATION

The existing 2.1 m fence is referenced only as **screening**.

It will be regularised separately and should not prejudice the outbuilding's consideration.

The outbuilding can be approved wholly on its own merits.

8. CONCLUSION

This proposal:

- Complies with **Policies GD1, D1**, and the **SPD** when read in full context.
- Reflects the **flexibility recognised by the SPD** for corner plots.
- Aligns with **NPPF § 134**, supporting approval where development enhances quality and causes no demonstrable harm.
- Produces **no impact** on amenity, daylight, privacy, or safety.

- Enhances local character through durable, coherent design and improved boundary definition.

For these reasons, I respectfully request that the Inspector **allows this appeal** and grants planning permission for the proposed outbuilding at **135 Broadwater, Bolton upon Dearne**.

Matthew Reynolds

October 2025