



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 July 2026

by **A Hartley, LLB (Hons), Solicitor, MBA**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 28 July 2026

Appeal Ref: 6010022

18 Canada Street, Barnsley S70 4JZ

- 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 Ms Aleema Sharif against the decision of Barnsley Metropolitan Borough Council.
- The application Ref is 2026/0078.
- The development is described on the planning application form as a 'Proposed domestic garage and summerhouse with ancillary games room/gym over.'

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of a two-storey outbuilding comprising of garage, sun lounge, gym and storage at 18 Canada Street, Barnsley S70 4JZ in accordance with the terms of the application reference 2026/0078 and 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: Plans and Elevations and Location and Site Plan.
 - 3) The external materials of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing dwelling.

Preliminary Matter

2. The Council changed the description of the development to 'Erection of two-storey outbuilding comprising of garage, sun lounge, gym and storage.' There is no confirmation before me that the change was agreed to by the appellant, however, this description is used in their appeal documentation. I have used the Council's description as it is more accurate.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling (No 18) and the area.

Reasons

4. No 18 is one half of a two-storey, red brick semi-detached dwelling with pitched roof. It is within an estate including houses of similar design. It is on a corner plot within a cul-de-sac, situated on a hillside. The topography is such that the properties to the rear are at a distinctly higher level. The rear garden to No 18 has also been excavated.

5. The development would introduce a two-storey outbuilding, which would conflict with the advice that garages be single storey, in the House Extensions and Other Domestic Alterations Supplementary Planning Document (2024) (SPD).
Notwithstanding the two-storey scale of the proposal, due to the lower ground level of the rear garden compared to the adjacent properties, as confirmed by the Council, the ridge height may not exceed that of the adjacent garage building at 19 Canada Street. The proposal would be visible from the street scene to the same extent as the rear garages to adjacent properties (Nos 19 and 20 Canada Street).
6. The size of the proposal would also exceed the advised dimensions set out in the SPD. However, from my observations on site, there would remain a sufficient external garden area. Further, due to the topography, ground levels, rear position of the outbuilding, and the existing pattern of rear outbuildings in the vicinity, the proposal would not appear incongruous by reason of its scale and design within the street scene.
7. Overall, notwithstanding there would be some partial conflict with the SPD, I find that the proposal would read as a subservient addition to the rear of the host dwelling in its context which would preserve the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area.
8. Consequently, the appeal proposal would respond positively to the scale and form of surrounding development within its immediate context. It would therefore comply with Policy D1 of the Barnsley Local Plan (2019), which seeks high quality design.

Other Matters

9. An interested party has raised concerns regarding overlooking from the rear velux windows and overshadowing of the patio areas of 11 and 12 Columbia Street, that are to the rear of the appeal site. The Council is satisfied that there would be no unacceptable harm to the living conditions of adjoining residents, in terms of the effect on privacy or loss of light. Having regard to the topography I observed on site, I find no reason to conclude otherwise.

Conditions

10. I have considered the conditions against the tests in the National Planning Policy Framework and the advice in the Planning Practice Guidance. I have imposed a condition setting out the statutory time limitation and a condition specifying the approved plans to provide certainty. I have included the standard materials to match condition in the interests of visual amenity. The Council has not suggested any other conditions are necessary, and I concur with this approach.

Conclusion

11. The proposed development would comply with the development plan when read as a whole. There are no material considerations which indicate that the decision should be made other than in accordance with the development plan. Therefore, for the reasons given, I conclude that the appeal is allowed.

A Hartley

INSPECTOR