



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 March 2018

by Gary Deane BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22nd March 2018

Appeal Ref: APP/R4408/D/18/3194385

2 Church Street, Great Houghton, Barnsley S72 0BL

- 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 David Randerson against the decision of Barnsley Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 2017/1389 was refused by notice dated 11 December 2017.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a detached garage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural matter

2. The proposed development is partly complete. The external walls are largely in place although the dual pitched roof differs to the proposal before me.

Main issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the local area.

Reasons

4. The development for which planning permission is sought is a detached garage to the rear of the appeal property, which is a 2-storey end terrace dwelling in a predominantly residential area. The new garage would be a sizeable addition. It would have a ridge height of 5.3-metres, a length of 10-metres and a width of 6-metres. Although no taller, it would be more substantial in built form than the detached garage that was recently granted planning permission¹ in broadly the same position and with the same footprint as the appeal scheme.
5. The proposed building would be simple in design and a condition could be imposed to ensure that the external materials would be appropriate. However, the new garage would be significant in scale and mass. The relatively high eaves level and a part flat roof would combine to visually accentuate its considerable bulk. Taken together, the proposed development would appear overly large and atypical of garages and other ancillary outbuildings that are generally found to the rear of residential properties.
6. The appeal dwelling and the wider terrace would partly screen the proposal in views from Church Street. It would, however, be visible from this highway

¹ Ref 2015/0417 dated 3 June 2015

through the gap at the side of No 2. From this vantage point, the completed building would draw the eye as an uncharacteristically large and bulky addition. At the site visit, I saw no buildings or structures to the rear of residential properties in the area around the site that would be comparable in scale or mass to the proposal. For these reasons, the proposed development would be obtrusive in the street scene and an unwelcome addition to the local area. The amendments made to the design and internal layout of the proposal do not, therefore, overcome some of the objections raised by the Council to an earlier proposal that included first floor windows and a dual pitched roof².

7. The Council's Supplementary Planning Document, *House Extensions*, states that detached garages should relate sympathetically to the main dwelling in style and proportions with a maximum eaves height of 2.5-metres from ground level. The National Planning Policy Framework also notes that planning should always seek to secure high quality design and that new development should add to the overall qualities of an area. For the reasons given, the proposal would not be in accordance with these important principles.
8. On the main issue, I therefore conclude that the proposed development would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the local area. As such, it conflicts with Policy CSP 29 of the Council's Core Strategy, which expects that development will achieve a high quality.
9. The Council raises additional concern in the Officer's report with regard to the effect of the proposal on the living conditions of the occupiers of the property that is attached to No 2. This is an important consideration and I have taken into account all of the evidence before me. However, given my findings on the main issue, this is not a matter upon which my decision has turned.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons set out above, and taking into account the absence of objections from others, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Gary Deane

INSPECTOR

² Ref 2017/0480 dated 3 August 2017