
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 January 2026

by **Laura Bartle BA(Hons) MSc MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25 February 2026

Appeal Ref: 6001825

95 Strafford Avenue, Elsecar, Barnsley, South Yorkshire S74 8AL

- 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 Peter Higgs against the decision of Barnsley Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 2025/0436.
 - The development proposed is described as: "Add two new sheds. Both less than 15m². A new workshop, a new games room."
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of 2 sheds to use as workshop and games room at 95 Strafford Avenue, Elsecar, Barnsley, South Yorkshire S74 8AL in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 2025/0436, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with drawings Location Plan; Site Plan 2025/0436; NG1; NW1.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall be those materials specified on the approved plans and the planning application form.

Preliminary Matters

2. The description of development in the heading is taken from the planning application form. However, I have used the description on the decision notice and appeal form in my decision above as it sets out the scheme more clearly and omits words not relating to acts of development.
3. The planning application form states the development started in March 2022. I saw during my site visit that both buildings had been erected but are not fully finished. I have therefore determined the appeal based on the scheme as proposed on the drawings.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

5. The appeal relates principally to the rear garden of a semi-detached dwelling. Consistent with the pattern of neighbouring residential plots long this northern section of Strafford Avenue, the rear garden is narrow and elongated in shape and falls away gradually towards the rear boundary.
6. The proposed workshop and games room would be located alongside the shared boundary with No. 97, beyond a toolshed near the rear wall of the dwelling. The workshop would be positioned close to the tool shed, roughly halfway down the garden. No other buildings are positioned close to the side boundary.
7. Based on measurements on the plans before me, the outbuildings within the rear garden would cover approximately 32 percent of its area when taken together. As such, this is consistent with the Council's House Extensions and Other Domestic Alterations Supplementary Planning Document (SPD), which advises that development should retain at least half of the garden area. Accordingly, the scheme would not result in a disproportionate amount of the rear garden being developed.
8. The garden comprises several distinct areas that contain a variety of common domestic hard and soft landscaping features. There is no dispute between the main parties that the scale, form and appearance of the individual structures would be acceptable and characteristic of conventional timber garden buildings. Subject to a condition to require the buildings to be finished in materials as specified on the drawings and application form, there would be consistency with the SPD in all other respects of the design.
9. Although both prior to and following the development outbuildings would appear to cover more of the rear garden than neighbouring properties, they would not be visually intrusive either individually or collectively. Indeed, substantial areas of the garden would remain free from built form and public views of the rear garden are limited. As such, the development would not give rise to a cumulative impact that would materially alter the residential character or appearance of the property or the wider surroundings.
10. For the above reasons, I conclude that the development would not have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the site and the surrounding area. Accordingly, I find no conflict with Policy D1 of the Barnsley Local Plan. Amongst other things, it seeks high quality design and development that expresses proposed uses through its composition, scale, form, proportions and arrangement of materials, colours and details. I note that Policy GD1 of the Plan is also referenced in the Council's reason for refusal, but no aspects of this policy relate to character and appearance matters and there is, therefore no conflict with the policy in this respect.

Other Matters

11. It has been put forward that noise and disturbance are generated by the use of the existing outbuildings. However, the scheme does not relate to those buildings. Moreover, I have no reason to conclude that the workshop or games room would generate unacceptable levels of noise or disturbance given the distance to the neighbouring dwellings and the likely activities within those buildings, which would be part of the site's overall domestic use.

12. The alleged prevalence of vermin and separately identified police matters are outside of the scope of this appeal. Similarly, fire safety matters fall within the building control regime and would be appropriately addressed should approval be required.
13. In addition to the materials condition referenced above, have imposed the standard conditions setting out the time limit for implementing the planning permission and the listing the approved drawings, for the avoidance of doubt.

Conclusion

14. Having had regard to the development plan as a whole and all other matters raised, I conclude the appeal should be allowed.

Laura Bartle

INSPECTOR