
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 January 2017

by Mike Hayden BSc DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 19 January 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/R4408/W/16/3157563

94 Barnsley Road, Brierley, Barnsley S72 9JY

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a failure to give notice within the prescribed period of a decision on an application for planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Eric Pickering against Barnsley Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 2016/0513 is dated 5 May 2016.
 - The development proposed is a detached garage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed and planning permission for a detached garage is refused.

Procedural Matters and Main Issue

2. The description of the development on the planning application form was amended by the appellant's agent by email on 22 September 2016 to "detached garage". I have determined the appeal on this basis.
3. Following the submission of the appeal against non-determination, the Council issued an officer report and "recommendation sheet" setting out its reasons for refusal had it been in a position to determine the application. Although the appeal site is in the Green Belt, the Council confirms that the proposed garage would not be inappropriate development in the Green Belt, as under the third bullet point of paragraph 89 of the National Planning policy Framework (the Framework) it would not result in a disproportionate addition over and above the size of the original dwelling, even taking account of previous extensions. On this basis the main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is located on the south-western edge of the village of Brierley, adjacent to open countryside. It lies at the entrance to the village. It is the first house on the north-western side of Barnsley Road on entering the village from the south-west and the last dwelling to be seen on this side of the road on leaving Brierley travelling from the north-east. The house is set back from the road affording views of the countryside beyond to the south-west as one leaves the village. The set back is reflected by dwellings on the opposite side of Barnsley Road and by the adjacent terrace of houses to the north-east, providing a spacious entrance to and exit from the village, which is important to the character and appearance of this end of Brierley.

5. The appeal dwelling is a bungalow, designed with its principal elevations facing south-east towards the road and south-west overlooking the garden to the property and the countryside beyond. The main gabled front elevation is very visible from Barnsley Road, particularly when approaching from the north-east. Although there are tall trees and shrubs along the south-eastern boundary of the property adjacent to the road, the bungalow is also seen in between gaps in the landscaping in views from the south-west.
6. Policy CSP 29 of the Barnsley Local Development Framework Core Strategy (2011) (the Core Strategy) states that development will be expected, amongst other things, to respect the townscape character in the borough, including the scale and layout of buildings. With particular regard to outbuildings, this is supported by the Barnsley Supplementary Planning Document on House Extensions (2012), which states that detached garages should relate sympathetically to the main dwelling and in most cases it will not be appropriate for a garage to be sited between the house and the road.
7. The proposed garage would be positioned forward of the main front elevation of the bungalow. I acknowledge that the pitched roof, brick built design of the garage would reflect the overall appearance of the bungalow. However, its position forward of the main house and close to the front boundary of the property would fail to respect the position and layout of the bungalow. Although the garage would be at a slightly lower level than the road, its roof would reach a height of 4 metres and be visible above the boundary fence between the trees. As such it would obscure views of the main elevation of the house when approaching from the south-west. It would be particularly prominent within the street scene in views towards the west and south-west, as illustrated by the photographic images submitted by the appellant. It would close up the vista between the bungalow and Barnsley Road, reducing the spaciousness at the entrance to the village and partially obscuring important views from the street out of the village to the surrounding countryside.
8. I note the appellant's arguments that due to the levels on the appeal site, which I saw fall away from the bungalow across the garden to the west and south-west, the proposed location is the only practical place to site the garage. However, this does not outweigh the harm which the proposal would cause to the character and appearance of existing dwelling and the surrounding area. I am also not convinced that it would not be possible to design and position a garage on the property so that it would be less prominent and intrusive within the street scene.
9. On this basis, I conclude that the proposed development would cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area. Consequently, it would be contrary to Policy CSP 29 of the Core Strategy. It would also conflict with paragraph 58 of the Framework which aims to ensure development adds to the overall quality of the area, responds to local character and reflects the identity of local surroundings.

Conclusion

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

M Hayden

INSPECTOR