



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 August 2022 by Andreea Spataru BA (Hons) MA

Decision by K Taylor BSc (Hons) PGDip MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18 August 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/R4408/D/22/3300000

The Cottage, The Kennels, Renald Lane, Hoylandswaine, Barnsley S36 7JX

- 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 Durr against the decision of Barnsley Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 2022/0214, dated 28 February 2022, was refused by notice dated 25 April 2022.
 - The development proposed is described as "additional level to part of the building and alterations".
-

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 are:
 - whether the proposed development would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt for the purposes of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) and the development plan; and
 - the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

Whether inappropriate development in the Green Belt

4. Paragraph 149 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) sets out the types of development that are not considered inappropriate in the Green Belt. These include the extension or alteration of a building, if it does not result in a disproportionate addition over and above the size of the original building.
 5. What constitutes a disproportionate addition is not defined within the Framework, thus an assessment of whether the proposed extension would be 'disproportionate' in the context of paragraph 149 is a matter of planning judgement. Policy GB2 of the Barnsley Local Plan 2019 (LP) states that the
-

extension or alteration of a building where the total size of the proposed and previous extensions does not exceed the size of the original building could be acceptable (equating to a 100% increase).

6. The appeal dwelling is a single storey building that includes an integrated garage. There is also a detached garage to the front/side of the house. The proposal would add a first floor above part of the building. Whilst there would be no increase in the footprint of the building, the floor space, along with the overall mass and scale of the house would be increased. Both the Council and the appellant agree that the development, even when taken cumulatively with previous additions, would not exceed the 100% threshold. On this basis and given the siting of the extension in relation to the host dwelling, the development would not result in a disproportionate addition over and above the size of the original building, in the context of the Green Belt policy.
7. Accordingly, the proposal would not be inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would accord with the provisions of the Framework. As the proposal does not amount to inappropriate development, there is no requirement to assess whether there would be an impact on the openness of the Green Belt or if there are other considerations that amount to very special circumstances.

Character and appearance

8. The appeal property sits within spacious grounds. Given the single storey nature of the dwelling, the existing building is not particularly visible to the public.
9. The dwelling has a rectangular shape, with a wide façade and considerable depth. The extension would project along the full depth of the house and along more than half of the existing width. This would result in considerable mass being added at first-floor level. The proposal would also involve the addition of numerous openings, particularly on the western elevation and in the new roof.
10. Given the siting of the extension in relation to the existing dwelling, significant bulk would be added to one side of the house. When viewed from the sides, the bulk of the extension would unbalance the existing proportions to such an extent that it would be harmful to the character and appearance of the existing building. Furthermore, the excessive glazing would also not be in keeping with the simple form and appearance of the host dwelling.
11. The extension has been designed with a similar roof style and materials to the host property, and there would be a very limited impact from the wider public views. However, these factors would not mitigate the harmful impact of the development.
12. My attention has been drawn to neighbouring properties, which vary in terms of scale. Whilst two-storey dwellings are not uncommon within the area, in this case the design and detailing of the extension would be harmful to the host dwelling. I do not find the appeal dwelling directly comparable with 'The Cottage', which is narrower in terms of depth and its first-floor massing is distributed more evenly. In any event, I have to consider each case on its own merits and site-specific circumstances.
13. In addition to the criteria relating to the size of an extension, Policy GB2 of the LP also requires that any development should respect the character of an existing building and its surroundings, in terms of its footprint, scale, massing,

elevation design and materials. This Policy has a broader application than the Green Belt policy in the Framework and it is relevant to any general consideration of the impact on the character and appearance of a locality.

14. For the above reasons, I find that through a combination of design, scale and massing, the proposal would result in harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and limited harm to the appearance of the surrounding area. Therefore, the development would be contrary to Policies D1 and GB2 of the LP, which collectively require, amongst other things, that development displays architectural quality including in terms of its scale, form, proportions, materials, and details.

Other Matter

15. I note that the appellant has not been satisfied with the Council's approach during the application process. However, my assessment has been limited to the proposal before me.

Recommendation

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

Andreea Spataru

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

17. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

K Taylor

INSPECTOR