
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 November 2016

by S J Lee BA(Hons) MA MRTPI

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

Decision date: 7th December 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/R4408/D/16/3155600

89 Rotherham Road, Monk Bretton, Barnsley S71 2NP

- 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 Alan Rawson against the decision of Barnsley Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 2016/0404, dated 14 April 2016, was refused by notice dated 29 June 2016.
 - The development proposed is the raising of the roof to form a loft conversion and single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is a detached redbrick bungalow with a concrete tile pitched roof, which is orientated with its gable facing the road. The dwelling stretches back into its plot, with the roof ridge perpendicular to the road. The site is accessed off an unnamed access road that runs parallel, but at a higher level, to Rotherham Road itself. A wide grass verge and footway separate the access road from the main road.
 4. The access road is lined on one side by a row of detached bungalows which, while not completely identical in terms of architectural style do, by and large, share similar characteristics. While this provides some variety to the street scene, the dwellings are of a generally harmonious and complementary character. The majority of dwellings in the immediate area appear to have retained their original scale, character and the urban grain of the street. This is particularly the case in terms of roof ridge heights and pitch angles. This is mostly noticeable in the many gable features which face the road, even where the overall design of the house may differ.
 5. This row of dwellings takes up a prominent position above and set back from the main road. In this context, the change in pitch angle and height would be clearly visible and conspicuous in its incongruity with the majority of other dwellings in the street. The additional height, bulk and prominence of the roof slope would result in an unduly dominant feature that would appear well above
-

the roofs of neighbouring properties when viewed along the street, which would be to the detriment of the generally uniform character of the area.

6. There would also be a lack of articulation on both the front elevation and along the roof slope and thus there is little to break up or soften the impact of the large expanse of roof slope or the overly steep pitch of the roof. This would serve to exacerbate the dominant and unsympathetic nature of the alterations.
7. The appellant has drawn my attention to the one example in the immediate vicinity of the site where alterations to the height of a bungalow have already been permitted. No 95 does add some variety to the street scene. However, this degree of alteration is clearly in a minority. In the context of the wider area, this variety is not necessarily welcome or something to be replicated. No 95 does stand out from the strong prevailing character and grain of the area, which appears to extend beyond the confines of the immediate area into nearby streets.
8. Therefore, I do not consider this earlier permission should justify any further erosion of the character of the street scene that would arise from the appeal proposal. Notwithstanding this, I have also noted that a new Supplementary Planning Document¹ (SPD) has been published since this development was granted permission. The context within which the earlier decision was made is somewhat different to that now and this carries significant weight in my decision.
9. As a result of the above, I find that the development would have a materially detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the area. Accordingly, there would be conflict with Core Strategy policy CSP29 which seeks to support development that contributes to creating an attractive neighbourhood. It would also conflict with the SPD which requires extensions at the front of dwellings to not detrimentally interrupt the harmonious pattern and continuity of the street scene.

Other matters

10. The appellant has drawn my attention to other developments which he considers are similar to that before me. While limited photographic evidence was provided, this is not sufficient to conclude that they represent a direct parallel to this scheme. The Council has also provided evidence as to why different decisions may have been taken in these cases. From this evidence, I cannot conclude there has been any inconsistency in the way the Council has considered these applications. In any case, each application and appeal must be considered on its own merits, as I have done in this case.

Conclusion

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

S J Lee

INSPECTOR

¹ House Extensions Supplementary Planning Document – Adopted March 2012