

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 May 2020

by R E Walker BA Hons DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 01 June 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/R4408/D/20/3245944

Middle Farm, Edderthorpe Lane, Darfield, Barnsley S71 5EY

- 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 Smith against the decision of Barnsley Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 2019/1106, dated 5 September 2019, was refused by notice dated 19 November 2019.
 - The development proposed is erection of double garage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The description of development given on the planning application form and appeal form differ slightly. I have used the description from the appeal form in the banner heading above which accurately describes the proposal and was used by the Council on its decision notice.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site forms part of the grounds of Middle Farm, a relatively small rendered bungalow adjacent to a group of converted stone-built buildings in residential use. The building group is positioned in open countryside and has a distinctly rural character.
5. The proposed garage would be a large structure positioned near the bungalow. Although the main parties' calculations of the footprint of the property differ, in either scenario the proposal would represent a sizeable addition in relation to the host dwelling. Although the host bungalow sits in reasonable sized grounds, the proposal would appear as a disproportionately large structure, rather than a subordinate one, competing with the host dwelling. To this end it would not appear sympathetic in its proportions to the host property.
6. I recognise that buildings in the countryside are often larger than their respective host properties. Moreover, there are a variety of buildings in the area including, amongst other things, garages, stables and large agricultural buildings. However, the proposal's location and design, would result in the appearance of an overly large domestic building relating to the host property

rather than any land-based rural activity. Moreover, none of the domestic buildings referred to appeared to be of a scale that dominates their respective host properties to the extent that the proposal would.

7. In arriving at this conclusion, I note that there was previously a barn at the appeal site. However, the proposed garage would not have the form, appearance or use of a barn but of a domestic building. As such, this previous building does not alter my findings on the proposal before me.
8. I note the appellant is willing to introduce stone as part of the proposal. However, my concerns relate not to the material finish in isolation but to the overall scale, form and appearance of the proposal in this location. As such, the use of stone would not alter or outweigh my findings on the main issue.
9. To conclude, the proposal would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the surrounding area. It would therefore conflict with the requirements of Policy D1 of the Barnsley Local Plan (LP) (adopted 2019) which seeks development to be of a high-quality design, amongst other things. The proposal would also conflict with the Council's House Extensions and Other Domestic Alterations Supplementary Planning Document (adopted 2019) which stipulates that detached garages should relate sympathetically to the main dwelling in style, proportions and external finishes. The proposal would also conflict with paragraph 127 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) which is concerned with achieving high quality design.

Other Matters

10. I note that the appellant was under the impression that the reinstatement of the demolished building and the subsequent conversion to a double garage was permitted development. However, this does not affect the planning merits or effects of the proposal before me.
11. The appeal site is located within the Green Belt. However, the main parties agree that the proposal would not be inappropriate development and I have no reason to disagree.

Conclusion

12. I note the appellant's reference to paragraph 10 of the Framework and in particular the presumption in favour of sustainable development. Good design is a key aspect of sustainable development and the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness. However, the proposed garage would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the surrounding area. Therefore, on balance and for the above reasons, I conclude that the proposal would not represent sustainable development as sought by the Framework.
13. For the reasons given above, and having regard to all other matters, the appeal is dismissed.

Robert Walker

INSPECTOR