



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 January 2021

by Paul Cooper MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 28 January 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/R4408/D/20/3263546

5 Calverley Gardens, Wombwell, Barnsley S73 0DT

- 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 & Mrs Townend against the decision of Barnsley Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 2020/0984, dated 31 August 2020, was refused by notice dated 26 October 2020.
 - The development proposed is 2 storey side extension, garage below bedroom bathroom above.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this case is the effect of the development on parking provision and highway safety.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a brick-built dwelling, one of three, and is built to the side of a turning head for the cul-de-sac. A driveway is located to the side of the property.
4. The appeal proposal is for a two-storey side extension, with a garage to ground floor and living accommodation above and would allow for an extra bedroom for the family of the appellant.
5. The Council have not raised any issue with the design of the extension in terms of a visual impact, but state that the garage section of the extension would not allow effective use of the garage space for the parking of vehicles, as it is below standard in width in terms of the guidance given in the South Yorkshire Residential Design Guide and also state that the space remaining to the front of the extension, if constructed, would not be of sufficient length to allow for the parking of a vehicle at the front of the extension without encroaching on the highway. The result of this is that the property would no longer have the two spaces required by a dwelling with three bedrooms or more set out in the Council's Supplementary Planning Document 'Parking' (2019) (the SPD)
6. At the time of my site visit (mid-morning) there were a number of cars parked on the cul-de-sac, of which some were parked in the turning head, which restricted space for vehicles to manoeuvre in the turning head with ease. From the evidence presented to me, it would appear that the appellants have two

cars. As a space would be lost as the side of the property could not be used (insufficient width) and the remaining space to the front would be insufficient to park a car off the highway safely, then it is highly likely that vehicles used by the appellants and visitors would have to park on the highway, exacerbating an already poor highway parking situation.

7. As a result, I find that the proposals are contrary to the adopted guidance set out in the SPD and also in conflict with Barnsley Local Plan Policy T4 which expects new development to be designed and built to provide safe access and movement, and should not add to problems of safety and efficiency of the highway.

Other Matters

8. I have noted the comments of the appellant with regard to the extension to the adjacent property, but I do not have full details of the proposal, and it was determined under a previous local plan regime. I have assessed the appeal proposal on its own merits and identified harm.
9. I recognise that the neighbours have not raised any objections to the proposal, and I have had regard to the desire of the appellant to provide additional accommodation and improve the living conditions for their family. However, I find that the harm identified would not be outweighed by the appellant's particular circumstances and all other considerations.

Conclusion

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

Paul Cooper

INSPECTOR