



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 May 2022

by Paul Cooper MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 9 June 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/R4408/D/22/3292715

3 Colster Close, Gawber, Barnsley S75 2LR

- 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 Brazier against the decision of Barnsley Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 2021/1108, dated 12 August 2021, was refused by notice dated 24 November 2021.
 - The development proposed is erection of extension to eaves and roof height of dwelling to create attic bedroom within the roofspace and provision of associated rooflights.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The description of development in the header above is taken from the Council's decision notice. I have the agreement of both parties that it could be changed from that submitted on the application form. Therefore, I am satisfied that neither party has been prejudiced in this matter.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The property subject to the appeal is two storeys in height, with an attached garage that is built over to give additional living space. It is built in brick, but with stone facing to the front elevation. The area is residential in nature, but the immediate locality is made up of predominately single storey dwellings, making the appeal property appear unusual in its surroundings.
5. The proposal would see an extension to the eaves above the garage in order to create additional roof in the roofspace to form another bedroom. This would raise the height of this section of the property above the ridge of the main dwelling, so to compensate, it is proposed to raise the ridge of the main dwelling by approximately 900mm. This would amend the pitch of the roof accordingly.

6. I find that the alteration of the roof height to the main dwelling, and subsequent change of the roof pitch, would make the property look incongruous in the area. At present, being the only two-storey property in the immediate locality, it has the outward impression of dominating its surroundings, which would be further magnified by the raising of the roof height and roof pitch.
7. Whilst it may not cause any additional harm to adjacent single-storey dwellings by overshadowing, the works involved in the creation of the proposal would accentuate its dominating position as the only two-storey dwelling in the immediate locality, focussing attention on its incongruity within the area and would create a negative aspect to the character and appearance of the area
8. As a result, I find that the proposal would cause harm to the character and appearance of the area, by means of the roof height increase, and the subsequent change to the roof pitch, which would be contrary to policy D1 of the Barnsley Local Plan (2019) that amongst other matters, expects development to be of high-quality design and be of an acceptable scale, form and proportions.

Other Matters

9. I recognise that the neighbours have not raised any objections to the proposal, and I have had regard to the desire of the appellant to provide additional accommodation and improve the living conditions for his family. However, I find that the harm identified would not be outweighed by the appellant's particular circumstances and all other considerations.

Conclusion

10. The proposal would therefore conflict with the development plan and there are no other considerations, including the Framework and its presumption in favour of sustainable development, that outweigh this conflict. For the reasons outlined above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Paul Cooper

INSPECTOR