The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 September 2019

by Paul Cooper MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13 September 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/R4408/D/19/3231868
48a Wakefield Road, Staincross, Barnsley S75 6JY

- 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 Mrs Sarah Hutson against the decision of Barnsley Metropolitan Borough Council.
- The application Ref 2019/0059, dated 13 January 2019, was refused by notice dated 12 April 2019.
- The development proposed is detached garage to front garden.

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for detached garage to front garden at 48a Wakefield Road, Staincross, Barnsley S75 6JY in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 2019/0059, dated 13 January 2019, 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 the following approved plans:

   ABAPA/2019/Hutson01; ABAPA/2019/Hutson02; ABAPA/2019/Hutson03; ABAPA/2019/Hutson04.

   3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing dwelling.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposed garage on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a detached two storey dwelling, on a row on similar. The properties are set back from Wakefield Road, with a variety of boundary treatments separating the properties from the highway. No 48 Wakefield Road adjacent has an existing garage located to the front of the property.

4. The appeal proposal is for a detached garage located to the front of the existing dwelling, close to the boundary with the highway. Policy D1 of the Barnsley Local Plan (adopted 2019) (the LP) states, amongst other matters, that development should be of high quality design and respect, take advantage

of and reinforce the local character and features of Barnsley. This is reinforced by the House Extensions Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) which states that proposals should be of a scale and design that harmonises with the existing building, not affect neighbouring properties, maintain the character of the street scene and not interfere with highway safety.

5. The garage would be seen in the context of the adjacent garage of No 48, which is established as part of the street scene of Wakefield Road. The Council have not raised objections to the design of the garage, which I concur with. I note the comments from the Highways team who state that there would be sufficient space to turn, park and manoeuvre two vehicles. This ensures that there would be no requirement to reverse out of the property onto the A61, and therefore highway safety would not be compromised.

6. I have noted the concerns of the Council in relation to protecting the open and spacious character of Wakefield Road in that location, but, in my opinion the built character of the area does not have such a strong character, with the presence of existing structures along that section of Wakefield Road, with a focus on the adjacent garage and the commercial premises, and whilst the golf course is opposite, the large car parking area and presence of structures in that area, in my opinion, further reduces the open and spacious character referenced by the Council.

7. The proposed garage would be seen within the same design context as the host dwelling, and I find that it would not appear unduly prominent or out of keeping with the street scene, given the presence of the adjacent garage.

8. Consequently, the appeal proposal would not bring harm to the character and appearance of the area. It would not conflict with the design aspirations of the National Planning Policy Framework, is consistent with the aims of LP policy D1 and the SPD.

Conditions

9. I have imposed the standard commencement condition, and a condition requiring the development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans, in the interests of certainty. I have also included a materials condition in the interests of the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above, the appeal is allowed.

Paul Cooper

INSPECTOR