



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 July 2017

by Darren Hendley BA(Hons) MA MRTPI

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

Decision date: 10th August 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/R4408/D/17/3174078

101 Genn Lane, Ward Green, Barnsley, South Yorkshire S70 6SY

- 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 and Mrs Paul and Andrea Luckman against the decision of Barnsley Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 2016/1340, dated 14 October 2016, was refused by notice dated 23 January 2017.
 - The development proposed is a two storey side extension to the existing dwelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the dwelling and the local area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a hipped roofed semi-detached house, sited on a corner plot, near to the junction of Genn Lane with Cromwell Mount. The house is set at an angle to the boundary with No 1 Cromwell Mount, such that the distance between the side of the house and the boundary narrows from the front to the rear elevation. The property is located on the edge of an area which is residential in character.
4. The proposed two storey side extension would be flush with the front elevation of the house and to the same height as the main roof pitch. The Council's Supplementary Planning Document House Extensions (2012) (SPD) states that a two storey side extension should be set-back from the front elevation, which allows for the extension to appear subordinate to the main dwelling and with a vertical break in the roof plane to lower the ridge height. The two storey side extension, by extending the line of the existing front elevation wall without a set-back and the lack of a vertical break in the roof plane, would not appear subordinate to the existing dwelling.
5. The house is prominent when viewed from the junction of Genn Lane with Cromwell Mount, which is further emphasised by its positioning on the plot forward of the house at No 1. The two storey extension would appear dominant in this prominent location and this would be further exacerbated as it would be viewed in conjunction with the proposed front single storey extension

projecting towards the site frontage. Although the forward positioning of the property on the corner plot reduces the potential for a terracing effect, the extension would result in an incongruous addition which would be discordant within this streetscene. I do not agree that the projecting single storey extension with accompanying mono-pitched roof running along the width of the front elevation would 'unite' the overall appearance and obviate the need for a set-back. It would serve to emphasise the mass and bulk of an inappropriate addition.

6. I appreciate that the tapering corner plot has presented design difficulties and that the Appellants have sought to avoid a convoluted roof design, but this does not justify departing from the SPD because of the detrimental effects which would arise from a dominant extension in a conspicuous position in the streetscene.
7. The appellant has drawn my attention to a number of two storey side extensions with no set-backs from their front elevations in the vicinity of the site. These are however sited off their respective boundaries with their neighbouring properties, and so they maintain a subordinate appearance, unlike the appeal proposal.
8. It may be possible to match materials such that the join between the existing front elevation and the extension would be visually acceptable, although the lack of a set-back would exacerbate detrimental visual effects, if the bonding was unsightly. The use of a hipped roof would be expected as the existing house has such a roof, and this can only be considered to be neutral. Finally, I have taken into account that the development relates to a need for family accommodation, although such a benefit would be personal to the appellants and does not outweigh the harm which I have identified. None of these matters alter my conclusions.
9. I conclude the proposal would have an unacceptable effect on the character and appearance of the dwelling and the local area, and therefore would not comply with Policy CSP 29 of the Barnsley Metropolitan Borough Council Local Development Framework Core Strategy (2011) that expects development to be of high quality, and respect townscape character, including building styles. I also conclude the proposal would not comply with the SPD in the absence of a set-back from the front elevation and the associated lack of a subordinate appearance.

Conclusion

10. I conclude the appeal should be dismissed.

Darren Hendley

INSPECTOR