
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 May 2024

by C Skelly BA (Hons) MSc MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12 June 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/R4408/D/24/3336265

11 Beech House Road, Hemingfield, Barnsley S73 0PF

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Ian Wilkinson against the decision of Barnsley Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 2023/0831.
 - The development proposed is bedroom loft dormer over existing garage ridge height increase plus front car port.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The Council has provided two reasons for refusal. The second reason for refusal relates to a proposed car port. The applicant has confirmed through the planning appeal statement of case that this is no longer contended, however no changes have been made to the submitted application drawings and therefore this reason for refusal still stands.
3. The National Planning Policy Framework was revised in December 2023 (the Framework). I have had regard to the Framework in my decision and I am satisfied that this has not prejudiced any party, particularly as the revision to the part upon which this appeal turns is only its paragraph number.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character of the host property and wider street scene.

Reasons

5. The appeal site is located on the edge of the settlement and is bounded to both sides by bungalows of differing styles. To the rear of the property is open countryside and there is a wooded area beyond the highway to the front of the property.
6. The property is a detached brick-built bungalow of simple design and proportions. The topography of the land slopes downwards across the site and the ridge height of the host property sits below those of the adjacent neighbouring properties. The main part of the property has three large windows to the front elevation, the width of which is greater than that of the garage. Together with its ridge height being stepped down from the bungalow this gives the garage a subservient appearance within the street scene.

7. The proposal is to raise the roof above the existing garage to provide accommodation above it, including two gabled dormer windows to the front and a box dormer to the rear. The garage door would also be reduced, and a window added alongside a door. A separate car port would be added to the front elevation.
8. The proposed change to the height of the garage would reverse the current stepped effect of the roof line, thereby changing its prominence in relation to the main part of the property. Although the increase in the height of the garage roofline would appear similar to those of neighbouring properties it would appear dominant and overbearing in relation to the host property.
9. The proposed dormers above the front of the garage would be flush to its eaves and run back to the ridge. Although there are dormers of similar style at 9 Beech Road, together with the dormer at the rear, the scale of the proposed dormers would unbalance the simple, well-proportioned appearance of the host property.
10. In light of their appearance and prominence, the proposed alterations to the garage would also represent visually obtrusive additions to the street scene.
11. The proposed car port would have a polycarbonate roof and be located over one of the windows and the front door of the main part of the property. The size, materials and design of the proposed car port would be out of keeping with the style and appearance of the host property and would appear incongruous within the wider street scene.
12. Although I note that the proposed development is required for family accommodation this would not outweigh the harm I have identified.
13. For these reasons, I conclude that the proposed development would have a significantly detrimental effect on the character of the host property and wider street scene. It would therefore conflict with the requirements of Policy D1 of the Barnsley Local Plan (2019) and the House Extensions and Other Domestic Alterations Supplementary Planning document (2019). These seek to ensure that extensions appear subordinate and in keeping with the original features of the host property. The proposal is also contrary to principles for good design set out in the Framework.

Conclusion

14. The proposal conflicts with the development plan and the material considerations do not indicate that the appeal should be decided other than in accordance with it. For the reasons outlined above the appeal is dismissed.

C Skelly

INSPECTOR