



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 February 2026 by S Jamieson BA(Hons) MPlan MRTPI

Decision by J Hills MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 24 March 2026

Appeal Ref: 6002313

135 Broadwater, Bolton Upon Dearne, Barnsley S63 8ER

- 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 Matthew Reynolds against the decision of Barnsley Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 2025/0708.
 - The development proposed is a rear garden outbuilding.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Preliminary Matter and Main Issue

3. An outbuilding was under construction at the time of my site visit but had not been completed. For the avoidance of doubt, I have determined the appeal based on the plans considered by the Council.
4. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. The appeal relates to a semi-detached dwelling occupying a corner plot on a residential cul-de-sac. The surrounding area predominately comprises semi-detached and terraced properties of varied design, some of which have been extended or have outbuildings. Such additions are typically modest in scale and are more often than not set back from front boundaries or positioned to the rear of dwellings. Together with the limited use of tall boundary treatments, this pattern of development gives the street scene a sense of openness that positively contributes to the character and appearance of the area.
6. The Council's House Extensions and Other Domestic Alterations Supplementary Planning Document (2024) (SPD) provides guidance on proposals for outbuildings. The SPD requires that such development relates sympathetically to the main dwelling in style, proportions and external finishes. It also sets out that the eaves height of outbuildings should not normally exceed 2.5m from ground level.

7. The proposed outbuilding would broadly reflect the appearance of the host dwelling and would be subordinate in height. However, its eaves would be significantly higher than the maximum heights normally supported in the SPD. While the wording in the SPD allows some flexibility in this regard, the siting of the outbuilding at the pavement edge, combined with its substantial extent along the front of the appeal site would be highly conspicuous to passersby. Even accounting for the existing fence, and regardless of whether this benefits from planning permission, due to its prominent siting and excessive scale, the outbuilding would have an enclosing and unwelcoming effect on the street scene. Notwithstanding the large corner plot it would sit within, the building would nevertheless undermine the area's spacious character. It would not therefore add to the overall quality of the area as required within paragraph 135 of the National Planning Policy Framework.
8. Consequently, the proposed development would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area. It would therefore conflict with policies GD1 and D1 of the Barnsley Local Plan (2019) which, amongst other things, require that development is compatible with neighbouring land and is of high-quality design that respects, takes advantage of and reinforces the distinctive local character and features of Barnsley.

Other Matters

9. I have had due regard to the Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED) contained in Section 149 of the Equality Act 2010, which sets out the need to eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation, and to advance equality of opportunity and foster good relations between people who share a protected characteristic and people who do not share it. I have also had regard to the Human Rights Act.
10. I have been made aware of health circumstances put forward by the appellant. While there is limited information before me regarding their specific needs, I do not doubt that the outbuilding would be of benefit to the appellant. This is therefore a matter of importance to which I afford weight. However, and in this instance, the development proposed would be permanent and remain indefinitely regardless of the needs of future occupiers. It is also unclear as to whether the same outcome could not be met by other, potentially less harmful, means. Therefore, the harms I have identified are such that a dismissal of the appeal would be a proportionate and necessary response that would not be outweighed by the requirements of the PSED.
11. I note there is a detached garage located close to the plot boundary at the corner of Broadwater and South Drive. I do not have the planning history of this development before me and do not know the circumstances in which it might have been granted planning permission. In any event, it has a pitched roof and a lower eaves height than the appeal scheme. This example also does not define the prevailing characteristics of the street, nor does it justify the appeal scheme which, for the reasons set out above, would be harmful.
12. I do not doubt that the building would be durable and well maintained. However, this would not mitigate the harm arising from its inappropriate siting and scale. The absence of objections is also not determinative, since there could be any number of reasons why no comments were made, and while there may be some local support from neighbouring occupiers, no comments to this effect are before me. This is

therefore a neutral matter and would not weigh in favour of the appeal, as is the lack of harm to neighbouring amenity, privacy, daylight, overshadowing and highway safety. Similarly, the removal of an overgrown hedge does not justify the proposal, and I am unconvinced that the appeal would be the only means of achieving an unobstructed pavement.

Conclusion and Recommendation

13. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

S Jamieson

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

14. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

J Hills

INSPECTOR