



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 February 2023

by Paul Cooper MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 09 March 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/R4408/D/22/3305198

Rockside, Cliff Road, Darfield, Barnsley S73 9HR

- 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 Michael Batty against the decision of Barnsley Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 2022/0061, dated 19 January 2022, was refused by notice dated 8 August 2022.
 - The development proposed is erection of new garage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for the erection of a new garage at Rockside, Cliff Road, Darfield, Barnsley S73 9HR in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 2022/0061 dated 19 January 2022 and the plans with it, subject to the conditions below:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
 - 3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans.

Procedural Matter

2. The Council has not raised issues with regard to any inappropriateness in the Green Belt as there appears to be some confusion with regard to the planning status of previous works to the property, but rather they have assessed the proposal with regard to the impact on the openness of the Green Belt with regard to policy GB2 of the Local Plan. I have no reason to dispute this assessment.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the locality and the openness of the Green Belt.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a detached bungalow which is the first property of a number that are served from an offshoot of Cliff Road. The access road serving the properties is sloping, so those properties are set above the main highway.

5. The proposed garage would be sited on an area of land used for parking by Rockside, located on the other side of the access road and would be an irregular shape like the parking area at present.
6. Cliff Road is a lightly trafficked highway, effectively a dead end that concludes in a water treatment works. The location of the appeal property is beyond the majority of Cliff Road properties and is semi-rural in setting.
7. The proposed garage would be partially covered by landscaping to the rear, so vehicles or pedestrians coming back up Cliff Road would have limited views of the garage.
8. Access to the properties further along the offshoot would not be affected by the proposal, as sufficient space would be available to pass the garage, were it to be built. Vehicles from Rockside already use this hard-surfaced parcel of land for parking.
9. Moreover, with its relatively low roof height, form, and materials of construction matching the main dwelling, the proposed building would not appear large or dominant when seen alongside the existing dwelling. Rather, it would appear as a subservient and subsidiary structure. As such, having regard to the comparatively low volume of the proposed garage and my above reasoning, I am satisfied that it would not amount to a disproportionate addition over and above the size of the original dwelling.
10. In terms of external materials and overall design, I consider that the proposed garage matches and complements the host building and its immediate surroundings. In that regard, I conclude that the proposal does not have an adverse effect on the character or appearance of the area.
11. It preserves the openness of the Green Belt. There is also no conflict with the purposes of the Green Belt, with its modest nature. It is not, therefore, inappropriate development when judged against the Framework and it complies with Policy GB2 of the Barnsley Local Plan (the LP).
12. The number of vehicle movements that would arise from the use of the new garage would be unlikely to reduce the openness of the Green Belt. I am satisfied that the proposal before me would preserve the openness of the Green Belt and would not conflict with the purposes of including land within it.
13. Based on the above, I find no conflict with policies GB2 and D1 of the LP which expect development, amongst other matters, to be of a high standard of design, have no adverse effect on the visual amenity of the area and preserve the openness of the Green Belt.

Conditions

14. The conditions suggested by the Council are standard conditions relating to commencement, matching materials and in accordance with the approved plans, in the interests of proper planning. I see no reason to amend these or add other conditions.

Conclusion

15. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should succeed.

Paul Cooper

INSPECTOR