
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 May 2024

by P Eggleton BSc(Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 24TH May 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/R4408/D/24/3340594

52 Garden House Close, Monk Bretton, Barnsley S71 2ED

- 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 Miss Marie Scott against the decision of Barnsley Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 2023/0894, dated 28 September 2023, was refused by notice dated 25 January 2024.
 - The development proposed is a first floor extension with loft conversion and balcony; and loft conversion to existing house with front and rear dormers.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The council's concerns relate to the proposed first floor front extension and the front dormer window. The single storey element of the property currently extends forward of the main bulk of the dwelling. The gap between this element and the pavement is quite limited. The new form and proportions of the building would, to some extent, reflect the form of the properties to the west. However, the position of the forward facing gable would result in it being overly dominant and imposing given its limited set back from the road. Its position towards the end of this row of properties, which have similar two storey building lines, would exacerbate this uncharacteristic prominence.
 4. The introduction of the dormer would also be at odds with the design detailing of this and nearby properties. Given that the dormer would extend to the full height of the roof, it would be a prominent new feature that would dominate the roofscape. The design of the structure would also be poor as the roof pitch would not match the new gable; and the glazing would be dominated by the structure, emphasising its intrusive scale. As it is not possible to align it with the windows below, this would add to its incongruous appearance.
 5. The overly prominent front gable and the dormer, both separately and together, would result in harm to the character and appearance of this area. The overall composition would represent poor design in this particular context.
-

The proposal would therefore be contrary to policy D1 of the Local Plan 2019 which expects high quality design that respects local character. It also conflicts with the Supplementary Planning Document: House Extensions and Other Domestic Alterations 2019 (SPD) which advises that front extensions should not detract from the character of the area. The SPD sets out that dormer windows should be restricted to the rear unless a characteristic feature of the street; and it provides guidance with regard to the size and position of dormer windows within the roof. This proposal would be at odds with this guidance. The National Planning Policy Framework 2023 is also clear that development that is not well designed should be refused.

6. Whilst reference is made to the similar form of the properties to the west, that front gable is set back beyond a long front garden. In this respect, the two properties and the prominence of the gables would differ significantly. Reference is also made to the permitted housing development opposite which is not yet built. The images provided illustrate forward facing gables that are set well down below the ridge and of proportions that respect the vertical emphasis of the house design. These smaller gables also appear to be set back from the road by a greater distance than the appeal proposal. They would not therefore be comparable with the scale and dominance of the gable proposed. It also appears that front dormer windows are not a feature of the approved scheme.
7. In conclusion, the proposal would result in unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the area. The matters put forward by the appellant in support of the proposal are not sufficient to outweigh my concerns. I therefore dismiss the appeal.

Peter Eggleton

INSPECTOR