



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 June 2017

by Darren Hendley BA(Hons) MA MRTPI

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

Decision date: 13th July 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/R4408/D/17/3172799

179A King Street, Hoyland, Barnsley S74 9LL

- 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 Jack Jones against the decision of Barnsley Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 2016/1338, dated 25 October 2016, was refused by notice dated 9 February 2017.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a two storey side extension and a single storey extension to the rear.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed insofar as it relates to the erection of a two storey side extension. The appeal is allowed insofar as it relates to the single storey extension to the rear at 179A King Street, Hoyland, Barnsley in accordance with terms of the application, Ref 2016/1338, dated 25 October 2016.

Procedural Matters

2. The appellant has confirmed that the address of the appeal site is 179A King Street. I have used the description of development that was given on the appeal form as there was agreement between the appellant and the Council that the description had changed from that stated on the planning application form. The single storey extension has been built and I have considered it retrospectively.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The appeal property comprises a semi-detached dormer bungalow. It contains a roof with a central ridge, with the eaves level set just above the ground floor windows and doors on the front and rear elevations. The property is set back approximately 5 metres (m) back from its King Street site frontage, with the front boundary defined by a stone wall of a height of approximately 0.5 m. There is a single storey rear 'lean to' extension, which is part of the development that is subject of this appeal.

-
5. The site lies in a residential area where, in its immediate vicinity, there are a mix of semi-detached, detached and apartment properties. They contain simple and balanced roof forms that are either gable ended or hipped. There is a complex of garages opposite, although these are discretely set back from King Street.
 6. The asymmetrical form of the proposed side extension would result in a short length of front roof slope that would be in marked contrast to the balanced length of the existing roof slopes on the property. The eaves on the front slope would be substantially set higher than the existing eaves on the property. This would result in a disjointed eaves height and a front elevation wall that would be substantially higher than the existing property, to give a stark vertical presence. The side extension, by not following the roof form of the existing property, would produce a discordant appearance to the building.
 7. The more complex roof form of the side extension with the existing property would not sit comfortably with the simpler appearance of the roof forms of neighbouring properties. This would also not satisfactorily be addressed by the distance the side extension would be set back from the existing front elevation of the property, in particular due to the open frontage of the site and that views of the extension would be afforded as the site is approached in a westerly direction up King Street. The proportions of the front roof plane would not appear to be in balance, when viewed from the streetscene.
 8. The materials would match the existing property and the design of the roof was amended during the planning application to attempt to address the Council's concerns. I have determined the appeal on the basis of the amended design. The roof slope would be at the same angle as the existing property and set down from the main roof ridge, although its form would be markedly different with its short front roof slope. When combined with the height of the front elevation wall, this would not appear subservient on the existing property.
 9. I conclude the side extension would have an unacceptable effect on the character and appearance of the building and the area. It would not therefore comply with Policy CSP 29 of the Barnsley Metropolitan Borough Council Barnsley Local Development Framework Core Strategy (2011) (Core Strategy) that expects development to respect townscape character, including building styles, and to be of high quality.
 10. Paragraph 56 of the National Planning Policy Framework (Framework) makes it clear that Government attaches great importance to the design of the built environment. This demonstrates the relevance of requiring good design in the consideration of this appeal. I find that the side extension does not comply with paragraph 60 of the Framework because although planning decisions should not seek to stifle innovation, originality or initiative, it is proper to seek to promote or reinforce local distinctiveness, which the side extension does not achieve.
 11. The side extension would also conflict with Barnsley Local Development Framework Supplementary Planning Document House Extensions (2012) because the asymmetrical form of the roof does not comply with the guidance that pitched roofs should follow the form of the existing roof.
 12. The rear extension is a small structure which, with its matching materials, is in keeping with the property. It is also near entirely screened from the

streetscene. The rear extension is not an area of dispute between appellant and the Council. I conclude the rear extension has an acceptable effect on the character and appearance of the building and the area. It therefore complies with Policy CSP 29 of the Core Strategy, the Framework in respect of design and the SPD.

Conclusion

13. I conclude the appeal should be allowed insofar as it relates to the single storey extension to the rear but dismissed insofar as it relates to the erection of a two storey side extension.

Darren Hendley

INSPECTOR