



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 July 2020

**by David Cross BA(Hons) PgDip(Dist) TechIOA MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 5 August 2020**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/R4408/D/20/3252240**

**6 Fearnley Road, Hoyland Common, Barnsley S74 0AU**

- 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 Jason Parkinson against the decision of Barnsley Metropolitan Borough Council.
  - The application Ref 2019/1411, dated 15 November 2019, was refused by notice dated 18 February 2020.
  - The development proposed is two storey side extension reinstating former demolished house footprint.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for two storey side extension reinstating former demolished house footprint at 6 Fearnley Road, Hoyland Common, Barnsley S74 0AU in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 2019/1411, dated 15 November 2019, subject to the following conditions:
  - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
  - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 201912[00]03 Rev 1.4; 201912[00]04 Rev 1.4; 201912[00]08 Rev 1.4; 201912[00]09 Rev 1.5; 201912[00]10 Rev 1.4; and 201912[00]11b Rev .1.
  - 3) 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.

### Procedural Matter

2. The description of development in the heading above has been taken from the planning application form which differs from that on the Council's decision notice. In Part E of the appeal form it is stated that the description of development has not changed and neither of the main parties has provided written confirmation that a revised description of development has been agreed. Accordingly, I have used the one given on the original application.

### Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and the wider area.

## Reasons

4. The appeal site is located at the end of a short terrace of properties. I saw that there are a number of similar terraces of varying lengths along Fearnley Road.
5. The proposed extension would be a substantial addition to the side of the existing dwelling, and the Council states that this would represent 80% of the width of the host building. In many circumstances, an extension of this scale would appear as an overdominant addition to the property to the detriment of character and appearance.
6. However, evidence provided by the appellant indicates that the site previously contained a dwelling which has been demolished at the end of this terrace. The proposal would therefore represent an extension which would broadly reflect the footprint of the demolished dwelling. In effect, this would be similar to the original extent of the terrace and would not appear as an unwarranted addition to the property or the wider streetscape.
7. Reference has been made to the use of a hipped roof for the extension, although the submitted plans depict a gable roof. I saw that the property at the other end of the terrace has a hipped roof design as do other terraces in the streetscape. However, the proposal would reflect the gable roof that is currently in place on the site and would present a neater side elevation compared to the structural features on the existing gable wall. Within that context I consider that the use of a gable roof would not warrant the refusal of planning permission.
8. I conclude that, due to the particular circumstances of this site, the proposal would not harm the character and appearance of the host property and wider area. The proposal would therefore not conflict with the design requirements of Policy D1 of the Barnsley Local Plan 2019.
9. The proposal would be contrary to the advice of the SPD<sup>1</sup> with regards to the projection of two storey side extensions and the set back of the front elevation. However, due to the circumstances of the site, the conflict with this advice does not lead me to a different conclusion in respect of character and appearance.
10. In addition to the standard 3 year time limitation for commencement, I have imposed a condition requiring the development to be carried out in accordance with the submitted plans in the interests of certainty. A condition in respect of materials is appropriate in the interests of character and appearance.
11. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

*David Cross*

INSPECTOR

---

<sup>1</sup> House Extensions and Other Domestic Alterations Supplementary Planning Document 2019 (SPD)