



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 April 2021 by Darren Ellis MPlan

Decision by Chris Preston BA (Hons) BPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11 June 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/R4408/D/21/3268656

4 Robin Lane, Royston, Barnsley, S71 4EA

- 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 Emma Littlewood against the decision of Barnsley Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 2020/0906, dated 14 August 2020, was refused by notice dated 17 November 2020.
 - The development proposed is described as Extensions to rear and to the height and length of the roof to convert existing bungalow into a chalet bungalow, with 1st floor living accommodation within the roof space, associated dormer windows and roof lights to front and rear and first floor window to side.
-

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 Issues

3. The main issues area the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area and on the living conditions of the occupiers of No 6 Robin Lane, with particular regard to light.

Reasons for the Recommendation

Character and appearance

4. Robin Lane serves three detached bungalows located behind Poplar Terrace. Two of the bungalows, No 2 and the appeal property, are very similar in appearance and form a distinct pair. The bungalow at No 6 was constructed more recently and is positioned at 90 degrees to Nos 2 and 4, however its design, scale and exterior materials are in keeping with the other bungalows. While the properties immediately adjacent to Robin Lane along Poplar Terrace are two-storey terraced properties, the uniformity in the design and appearance of the bungalows defines the character of the area and creates an attractive and coherent small cul-de-sac.
 5. The proposal would see the appeal property extended upwards and to the rear to create a first floor, a rooflight to the front elevation and a dormer windows
-

to the front and rear roof slopes. Whilst the eaves level and roof pitch would be unchanged, the ridge would be raised by approximately 1.5m and would be set further back than the existing ridge. This would create a dwelling that would, in comparison with its neighbours, have a top-heavy form and massing.

6. Furthermore, the effect of the proposed change in roof heights would be compounded by addition of the rooflight and dormers. These features would not align with other windows or openings in the property and would disrupt the symmetry that exists between the appeal site and No 2. As noted, the properties were clearly built as a pair and the existing symmetry adds to the consistent character of the cul-de-sac which is a positive feature of the area. Together with the change to the form of the property, the extended dwelling would appear as an incongruous feature in the street scene that would detract from the modest and consistent appearance of the surrounding bungalows.
7. For these reasons, the proposal would conflict with Policy D1 of the Barnsley Local Plan (January 2019) (LP) and the guidance within the Supplementary Planning Document 'House Extensions and Other Domestic Alterations' (May 2019) (SPD), which both seek to ensure that developments are of high quality design that respect local character.

Living conditions of the occupiers of No 6 Robin Lane

8. The properties at both the appeal site and No 6 are close to the shared boundary between these properties. The appeal property is already set behind the side elevation of No 6. The extended property would project significantly beyond the rear of No 6 which, in addition to increase in ridge height and the setting back of the ridge, would appear as a dominant structure, particularly when viewed from the garden and south-facing windows of No 6. Consequently, it would have an overbearing impact that would detract from the enjoyment and thereby the living conditions of the neighbouring occupiers.
9. The appeal property is to the west of No 6 and consequently the extended property, due to the increased rear projection and height and its proximity to the neighbouring property, would cause additional overshadowing to the south-facing windows and the garden area closest to the house. Due to the positioning of the properties, the additional overshadowing would occur during late afternoons and evenings, particularly during winter months when the sun is lower in the sky.
10. For these reasons, the proposal would cause harm to the living conditions of the occupiers of No 6 Robin Lane. Consequently, the proposal would conflict with Policy GD1 of the LP and the guidance within the SPD, which both seek to ensure that developments do not adversely affect the living conditions of residents.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

Darren Ellis

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

12. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and, on that basis, I agree with the recommendation and shall dismiss the appeal.

Chris Preston

INSPECTOR