

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 January 2018

by Anne Jordan BA (Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 3rd April 2018

Appeal Ref: APP/R4408/D/17/3191490

Rowethby, 41 Intake Lane, Gawber, Barnsley, S75 2HX

- 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 Stuart Lowden against the decision of Barnsley Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 2017/1342, dated 4 October 2017 was refused by notice dated 20 November 2017.
 - The development proposed is a garage and associated works.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a detached double garage to dwelling at Rowethby, 41 Intake Lane, Gawber, Barnsley, S75 2HX in accordance with the terms of the application ref 2017/1342, dated 4 October 2017 and the plans submitted with it and subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plan - 2017/29/02 Rev A.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used on the adjoining dwelling house, Rowethby.
 - 4) The parking/manoeuvring facilities shall be surfaced in a solid bound material and made available for the manoeuvring and parking of motor vehicles prior to the development being brought into use, and shall be retained for that sole purpose at all times.

Procedural Matter

2. The Council altered the description of development to "erection of a detached double garage to dwelling". As it is unclear what any proposed associated works would be, I consider that the Council's description more accurately and concisely describes the development and I have determined the appeal on that basis.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of 41 Intake Lane and the wider area.

Reasons

4. Rowethby is a detached bungalow which sits back from the road on a large plot. It sits in a residential street of properties of varying age and appearance. The wide range of architectural styles in evidence gives the road a pleasantly diverse character with the well established front gardens and mixture of boundary treatments adding further variety to the streetscene.
5. The appeal proposal relates to a double garage to be located to the front of the dwelling adjacent to the side boundary with No 43. The Council have no objection to the appearance or size of the garage, but rather consider that the location of the structure, to the front of the dwelling, would be unacceptable.
6. I noted during my site visit that although dwellings on the eastern side of the road followed a nominal building line as they rose up the hill, due to differences in the size and appearance of dwellings there was no homogeneity in the streetscene. 2 dwellings further downhill, Nos 28 and 31 had very large garages in their front gardens and despite being significantly larger than the appeal proposal, these sat comfortably in the varied streetscene. I am therefore of the view that within this context, the introduction of a garage would not appear incongruous. Furthermore, the structure is relatively modest in size, and at worst would obscure only a small part of the front elevation in some views into the site. In this respect it would sit comfortably within the domestic setting for the dwelling behind and would not be prominently visible in the wider residential streetscene.
7. I take into account guidance within the *Supplementary Planning Document – House Extensions*, which states that in most cases it will not be appropriate for a garage to be sited between the house and the road. However, I am satisfied that in this case the proposal would maintain the character of the streetscene and would be of a scale and design which harmonises with the existing building. Therefore taking into account the varied streetscene, in which existing garages sit comfortably, I am satisfied that the proposal would not harm the character and appearance of the property or the wider area.
8. I therefore conclude that the development would not cause harm to the character and appearance of either Rowethby or the wider area. Accordingly I find not conflict with policy CSP29 of the *Barnsley Core Strategy* which seeks new development which creates attractive, sustainable and successful neighbourhoods. This reflects guidance contained within the *National Planning Policy Framework* which has similar aims.
9. For the reasons set out above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal be allowed. In addition to conditions relating to timescale and approved plans I also consider it necessary to impose a condition relating to the proposed materials, in order to ensure a satisfactory appearance for the development. Furthermore, in order to ensure satisfactory provision is made for the manoeuvring of vehicles and in the interests of highway safety, I also consider it necessary that a condition is imposed requiring the provision and retention of the proposed turning area.

Anne Jordan

INSPECTOR