
Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 4 June 2019

by William Cooper BA (Hons) MA CMLI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 2nd July 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/R4408/D/19/3224607
32 Honeywell Place, Barnsley S71 1QB

- 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 Mark Whiteley against the decision of Barnsley Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref: 2018/1379, dated 26 October 2018, was refused by notice dated 21 December 2018.
 - The development proposed is a detached double garage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The new Barnsley Local Plan (2019) (LP) has been adopted since the Council's decision. This supersedes the Barnsley Core Strategy (2011). Adopted Policy D1 of the LP broadly accords with the policy rationale set out by the Council in its Delegated Report, at the time of its decision. Accordingly, in my assessment of the proposal, I have regard to the relevant policy in the LP.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The location of the appeal proposal is in the garden of a bungalow, within a residential area. The proposal is for a detached double garage.
5. The adopted Barnsley House Extensions Supplementary Planning Document (2012) (SPD) provides design guidance for house extensions, roof alterations, outbuildings and other domestic alterations. In order to complement townscape character, the SPD's general principles include that proposals should maintain the character of the streetscene. In this respect, the SPD broadly accords with Policy D1 of the LP, which requires that development complements local character, taking account of townscape and vistas. The detailed guidance on Annexes and Outbuildings within the SPD states that 'in most cases, it will not be appropriate for a garage to be sited between the house and the road'.
6. Looking down Honeywell Place from west of the appeal site, the street is characterised by dwellings set back from the highway, with substantially

uniform front building lines, on both sides of the road. In the neighbourhood, a number of garages are located to the side and rear of dwellings. I saw that the proposed location of the garage adjoins the junction of an approximately 'T' shaped configuration of pedestrian routes, whereby the 'L' of Honeywell Place's highway layout joins with a public footpath and cycleway which runs to the east of the appeal property. The footpath's entrance connects with a 'green corridor' which adjoins the south eastern boundary of the appeal site. The vista around the head of the 'T' therefore has townscape value, as a focal point for both the street and the entrance to the green corridor.

7. Whilst the Proposed Section, Plan and Elevations drawing shows a triangular buffer of land adjoining the east of the garage as part of the dwelling's garden, without the public footpath being illustrated, the footpath exists as described above.
8. The proposed location of blank brick side and rear facades of the garage 'hard up' against the front pavement on Honeywell Place and the entrance to the footpath and cycleway would be visually jarring. The proposal, in combination with the existing tall wall south west of the neighbouring property's garage, would result in a visually discordant 'pinchpoint' around the entrance to the 'green corridor', looking from the street along Honeywell Place.
9. The proposed garage's proximity to the front boundary of the appeal site would offer little opportunity for screen planting. Moreover, the proposal's location forward of the front building line of the host bungalow, and the garage's blank side facade adjoining the pavement, would, together, have a visually intrusive effect on the streetscene, including the vista to the green corridor beyond.
10. I note the appellant's view that the proposal's location, would acceptably reduce its visual dominance, and comply with the SPD. I accept that as the proposal would not be sited directly in front of the host bungalow, it can be viewed as not being 'between the house and the road'. However, I saw that the proposal would appear, looking down Honeywell Place from west of the site, as forward of the bungalow, and between the latter and the road. Moreover, I consider that the proposal would conflict with the SPD's general principle that development should maintain the character of the streetscene, for the reasons described above.
11. It is recognised that the neighbouring garage, and the superstore to the east, form part of the view looking down Honeywell Place. However, this does not diminish the importance of the focal point, with its substantial green backdrop, as described above. It is acknowledged that the garage's materials are proposed to match the bungalow. However, this does not outweigh the harm identified.
12. I note that, according to the appellant, a planning application was approved in 1981 for a detached garage in the same location as the current proposal. However, the submitted layout drawing for the previous scheme shows a smaller garage footprint than the appeal proposal, and does not include the public footpath which exists, as described above. Moreover, significant fresh policy and guidance within the LP and SPG have been adopted since 1981. These factors, in combination, limit the weight which I attach to the previous scheme.

13. The planning appeal decision and examples of detached garages on other sites in Barnsley, cited by the appellant, are noted. However, the proposal has its own setting and circumstances, and I assess it on its own merits.
14. In conclusion, the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the area. As such it would conflict with Policy D1 of the LP, which seeks to ensure that development complements local character.

Conclusion

15. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

William Cooper

INSPECTOR