
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 February 2021

by T J Burnham BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 1 March 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/R4408/D/20/3259021

15 Bramham Croft, Wombwell, Barnsley, South Yorkshire S73 8BE

- 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 Danny Wright against the decision of Barnsley Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 2020/0373, dated 17 March 2020, was refused by notice dated 31 July 2020.
 - The development proposed is a double storey side/rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural matter

2. The description of the proposal has been altered on the Council decision notice. The original description however adequately describes the proposal and I have determined the appeal on this basis.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area with particular regard to the lack of a set back on the extension from the front wall of the original dwelling.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is a detached double fronted dwelling set within a modern residential development. A double storey extension to the side and rear is proposed, the front wall of which would be flush with the front elevation of the existing dwelling.
5. The street scene is mixed, incorporating terraced and semi-detached dwellings. There are also larger detached properties within the street. Where accommodation is incorporated above the garages to the sides of some of these detached properties, this is generally set back from the main front elevation, a design feature which serves to break up the mass and bulk of the larger properties.
6. Building more detail on the broader design principles within Policy D1 of the Barnsley Local Plan (2019) (BLP) SPD¹, guidance is provided on two storey side

¹ Barnsley Local Plan Supplementary Planning Document House Extensions and Other Domestic Alterations May 2019

extensions. The guidance states that to prevent a terracing effect and to avoid detrimental changes to the character of the street scene, it will be desirable to provide a setback of at least 500mm from the main front wall of the dwelling. It also advises that an extension should appear as an extension, and particularly in the case of two storey side extensions a small set back of the extension from the main wall will be required.

7. While the lack of a setback would not result in a terracing effect as the property is detached and sits on its own plot, the guidance is not in place to mitigate such an effect alone. The extension would add significant width to the property, which would afford it a wide and bulky appearance in the absence of a setback. This would be at odds with the character of the street scene.
8. The proposal would therefore have a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the area. The proposal would subsequently fail to accord with SPD guidance as it would not incorporate the required set back. The proposal would also fail to accord with Policy D1 of the BLP which amongst other things requires development of a high-quality design that will reinforce local character including the scale and building styles of the built form in the locality. I have afforded the SPD guidance significant weight given that it is recent and designed to be read in close conjunction with the BLP.

Other Matters

9. I accept that it is likely that similar materials could be found for the extension and that the lack of a setback would not inevitably result in the unsightly bonding of old and new materials. However, there is nothing within the evidence to suggest the exact same materials could still be sourced, so this matter remains somewhat unresolved. On my site visit I was also able to view the extensions drawn to my attention at No.1 and No.2 Leyfield Place. However, I did not consider these appeared significantly disjointed with the host dwellings and I do not therefore consider that they justify omitting the set back from the extension.

Conclusion

10. The appeal should therefore be dismissed.

T J Burnham

INSPECTOR