



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 March 2019

by Sarah Colebourne MA, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 5th April 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/R4408/D/19/3221071

21 Kings Court, Wombwell, Barnsley, S73 0FB

- 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 Lorna Akyel against the decision of Barnsley Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 2018/1374, dated 30 October 2018, was refused by notice dated 23 January 2019.
 - The development proposed is a brick outbuilding to the rear of the dwelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Reasons

2. 21 Kings Court is a small detached dwelling with a pitched roof on a recently built residential estate. It is located in the top corner of a cul-de-sac. The brick outbuilding, which has already been constructed, is sited in the rear garden, alongside the side boundary. The original permission for the estate included a pair of garages at the front of the dwelling to serve the appeal dwelling and the neighbouring property but these were not built. The appellant says that the design of the building was based on what would have been their half of the approved garage block. As such, it has an unusual mono-pitched roof with the ridge alongside the side boundary.
3. It is sited on the rear part of the garden which is at a higher level than the ground floor level of the house and patio of the appeal property and is higher than those of the more traditional houses to the side. With a ridge height of 3.8m, it is significantly higher than the boundaries of the property. Consequently, despite being hidden from public view, it can be seen from many of the surrounding houses. Its siting, scale and height make it unduly prominent and although it has matching materials to the house it appears stark and incongruous, neither reflecting the roof form and pitch of the house or providing a low key solution as a flat roof may have done.
4. Whilst I saw that there are a number of other dwellings with detached garages on this estate, the roof forms of those complement the dwelling which they serve, as at no 8 for example. Although the outbuilding may be lower in height than the original approved garage and other garages on the street, those are not sited in the rear gardens of those properties and have a different relationship.

5. I understand that the building is required for storage and it is unfortunate if the appellant has been misled by the developer as alleged. I have noted the personal and financial circumstances of the appellant. I have also noted that there have been no objections from neighbouring residents.
6. However, the purpose of the Council's development plan policy D1 in the Barnsley Local Plan (2019) is to ensure that development is of a high quality, taking into account scale and form. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the proposal conflicts with the development plan and would harm the character and appearance of the dwelling and the area. There are no material considerations that justify determining the appeal otherwise and the appeal should be dismissed.

Sarah Colebourne

Inspector