



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 October 2020 by L Wilson BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

Decision by Chris Preston BA (Hons) BPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13 October 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/R4408/D/20/3257113

9 Windermere Road, Penistone, Barnsley S36 8HL

- 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 Robert Fields against the decision of Barnsley Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 2020/0464, dated 11 May 2020, was refused by notice dated 29 July 2020.
 - The development proposed is described on the application form as proposal of application of off white render to front elevation of house. Our property is on a high elevation, situated facing the Pennines and gets a lot of wind against the front of the house from the valley in front. The wind literally blows through the entire house thus causing heat to escape. In order to increase the efficiency of the house (heating) we would like to apply insulation boards to the front of the property and then apply render over the boards.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issue

3. The effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. No. 9 is situated within a residential estate which is characterised by brick-built dwellings. Within the estate, there are slight variations in the colour of the bricks, but they are all a brown shade. There are no rendered properties. The use of brick is a key element in the character of the host property and estate.
5. The proposed off white render would appear as a stark contrast against the brown brick and would draw the eye. The scheme would appear at odds with the host building and estate. This is because it would introduce a building material which does not harmonise with the palette of materials and colours that contribute to the character and appearance of the host property and street scene. The harmful impact of the scheme would be exacerbated by the fact that No. 9 is situated on a main road in the estate and is elevated from the

highway. Accordingly, the proposed development would be an unduly prominent and incongruous feature which would diminish the sense of coherence within the street scene.

6. Whilst the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) states that change or innovation should not be discouraged, it also states that schemes should reflect local character. In this case, the consistency in design and materials is a key element of the character of the estate and the divergence from the established palette of materials would cause harm to the character and appearance of the area for the reasons given.
7. The appellant has drawn my attention to two approved applications in the local area, which feature similar render¹. I visited these properties on my site visit. I observed that there is a greater mix of building materials within the surrounding area of Hall Gate and Well House Lane compared to the street scene of Windermere Road. The highlighted properties are situated in the context of other dwellings which have different coloured brick, stone and render. Therefore, the character and appearance of the highlighted areas differ to the context of the appeal site. Consequently, these approvals cannot be directly compared to the scheme before me and each application must be determined on its own individual merits.
8. The proposed development would improve the insulation of the property which would help the appellant reduce their carbon footprint. Whilst I understand the importance of reducing carbon emissions, such benefits would not outweigh the harm identified. Moreover, it is not clear whether other means of achieving the same ends without significantly altering the principal elevation have been investigated.
9. For these reasons, the proposed development would be visually harmful to the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area. The scheme would conflict with Policy D1 of the Barnsley Local Plan (2019), The Barnsley Local Plan: House Extensions and Other Domestic Alterations Supplementary Planning Document (2019) and the Framework which seek, amongst other matters, to promote high quality design and ensure new development respects the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion and Recommendation

10. For the reasons given above I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

L M Wilson

APPEALS PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

11. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report, and, on that basis, I agree and conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Chris Preston

INSPECTOR

¹ Planning application references: 2018/0975 and 2017/1262