The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 October 2023

by Elaine Benson BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date:

Appeal Ref: APP/R4408/D/23/3328420
105 Saville Road, Dodworth, Barnsley, South Yorkshire S75 3PZ

- 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 Jarrod Waistnidge against the decision of Barnsley Metropolitan Borough Council.
- The application Ref 2023/0164, dated 16 February 2023, was refused by notice dated 6 June 2023.
- The development proposed is detached double garage.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Reasons

2. The proposed double garage would be located between the front of the host dwelling and the road. The front garden of the site is enclosed by 1.8m fencing to either side and by a low wall with an approximately 4m high row of conifers to the roadside boundary. The ground level falls away steeply towards the road and it is proposed to excavate the ground further to reduce the overall height of the garage.

3. Saville Road can be characterised as comprising undeveloped open frontages which are primarily used for parking and as amenity space. The garage would be large and would stand in front of the Saville Road building line, thereby introducing development into this spacious area and significantly reducing the amount of undeveloped front garden. The conifer hedge and the reduction in ground level would limit some views of the proposed garage from the road. However, the conifers would only screen the garage directly from the front. There would be views into the site from both side directions above the boundary fences and the garage would also be clearly visible from neighbouring properties. Thus, in the proposed location the proposed development would appear out of character with the surrounding area.

4. There is a detached garage to the front of the dwelling at 109 Saville Road. It differs from the appeal proposal as it is smaller, stands close to the host dwelling and is set back considerably from the road. The neighbouring garage therefore does not impact on the openness of the frontage to the same degree as the proposed development.

5. In terms of setting a precedent for further similar development, each planning application should be determined on its individual merits. Furthermore, the

host dwelling is of an individual design and layout and the existing boundary treatments are unlikely to be repeated elsewhere.

6. Overall, I conclude that the appeal proposal would harm visual amenity and is therefore contrary to Barnsley Local Plan Policy D1, which, in summary, expects development to be of a high-quality design and to respect, take advantage of and to reinforce the distinctive, local character and other features. Furthermore, the proposal would not satisfy the design criteria set out in the National Planning Policy Framework. The garage would meet some of the requirements of the Council's SPD: 'House Extensions and other Domestic Alterations' in that it would relate sympathetically to the main dwelling in style, and external finishes. However, there is unacceptable conflict with the guidance that 'in most cases, it will not be appropriate for a garage to be sited between the house and the road'.

7. For the reasons set out above, the appeal is dismissed.

Elaine Benson

INSPECTOR