



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 November 2025

by **N McGurk BSc (Hons) MCD MBA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21 November 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/R4408/D/25/3373917

3 Rydal Close, Penistone, Barnsley, S36 8HN

- 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 Jeremy and Louise Godley against the decision of Barnsley Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 2025/0270.
 - The development proposed is a first floor extension, two storey side extension, single storey front extension, demolish existing garage and construct double garage, convert garage, alterations to drives, alterations to fenestration and doors, new boundary walls/fencing.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The description of the proposed development is taken from the application form. The applicant has confirmed that the proposed single storey front extension was removed from the proposal following the submission of the application.
3. The description of the proposed development refers to a double garage. The appellant has stated that works have commenced on a garage previously approved¹ and that this previously approved garage will be constructed as approved.
4. The previous approval referred to above was for a first floor rear extension, replace rear detached single garage with double garage, convert integrated front garage into habitable area, widen front drive and alterations to fenestration and doors to dwelling. Consequently, the proposal the subject of this previously approved application differed significantly from the proposal the subject of this appeal.

Main Issue

5. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

6. The appeal property is a detached two storey dwelling. It is located in a residential area characterised by the presence of detached bungalows and detached two storey dwellings set within comfortable garden plots.

¹ Reference: 2025/0254.

7. The appeal property occupies a prominent site along Rydal Close, as it turns a corner. This results in the side and rear elevations of the dwelling, as well as its side garden area, being widely visible in their surroundings, most notably from Rydal Close and from its nearby junction with Windermere Road.
8. Like other dwellings in the area, the appeal dwelling is set back from the road behind a front garden and short driveway. Due to its corner location, it also has a side garden area between the dwelling and the road, as well as a rear garden.
9. The presence of front and side gardens combines with gaps between detached dwellings to provide for a notably green and spacious local character. Further to this, during my site visit, I noted that whilst many houses have been altered and/or extended over the years, such changes tend to appear in keeping with host dwellings and the surrounding area.
10. This is an important consideration, as I also observed during the course of my site visit that the area benefits from a strong sense of visual coherence, rhythm and uniformity, attributes which arise from similarities in the design, form, scale and materials of the area's dwellings.
11. In addition to the above, the front and side gardens of properties on corner plots, including the appeal property, contribute significantly to the area's green and spacious qualities. Further, a notable feature of the wider area is a general absence of tall or obtrusive boundary features to the front and side dwellings and this is a major contributing factor to the area's spacious qualities.
12. The proposed development would extend the appeal dwelling to the side across two stories. I find that this would result in the host dwelling appearing excessively tall and wide on its plot, in a manner that would appear out of character with neighbouring dwellings, not least due to the visually awkward fenestration and staggered form of development proposed.
13. The harmful visual effect of this would be exacerbated by the tall, two storey height of the proposal, along with its projection along the majority of the length of the dwelling, such that it would comprise a large and bulky addition. The visual harm arising from this would be emphasised by an unbalanced effect resulting from the stepping down of the proposed roof.
14. In addition to the above, I also find that the siting of the proposed side extension, in a prominent corner location widely visible in its surroundings, would result in it drawing undue attention to itself as a large and incongruous addition.
15. Further, by extending into the appeal property's side garden area, the proposal would severely erode that part of the appeal property's positive contribution to the area's identified green and spacious attributes. The harm arising from this would be exacerbated by the proposed fence, which would appear as an unduly tall, prominent and obtrusive feature, out of keeping with the area's more open and spacious qualities.
16. Taking all of the above into account, I find that the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the area, contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework and to Policies GD1 and D1 of the Barnsley Local Plan (2019), which together amongst other things, seek to protect local character.

Other Matters

17. In support of their case, the appellants draw attention to other developments in the area. However, there is nothing before me to demonstrate that these other developments are so similar in all circumstances to the proposal the subject of this appeal as to provide for direct comparison.
18. In any case, I have found that the proposed development would result in significant harm and this is not something that is reduced or mitigated by the presence of other developments elsewhere.
19. The appellants state that their side garden is used for dog fouling. However, the proposed development would result in harm and I note that there is nothing before me to demonstrate that the proposal comprises the only way that the anti-social behaviour highlighted might be addressed.

Conclusion

20. For the reasons given above, the appeal does not succeed.

N McGurk

INSPECTOR