



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 November 2025 by S Jamieson BA(Hons) MPlan

Decision by L C Hughes BA (Hons) MTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13 January 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/R4408/D/25/3370818

25 Cloisters Way, Monk Bretton, Barnsley S71 2JN

- 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 Peter Tomes against the decision of Barnsley Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 2025/0237.
 - The development proposed is rear metal first floor balcony with side screening and glass balustrade.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector 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 the effect of the proposed development on:
 - a) the character and appearance of the host dwelling; and
 - b) the living conditions of occupiers of No 23 Cloisters Way (No 23), with particular regard to privacy, outlook, noise and light.

Reasons for the Recommendation

Character and appearance

4. The appeal dwelling is a semi-detached property that occupies an elevated position towards the end of a suburban cul-de-sac. The surrounding area predominately comprises detached and semi-detached dwellings which are of a similar age and display simple, modest architecture. There is a limited palette of materials in the vicinity including a prevalence of brick, with some limited rendering and cladding. Taken together, this commonality gives order and consistency to the area that contributes positively to its character and appearance.
5. The host dwelling has already been subject to alterations, including a single storey front projection and dormer windows to the front and rear. While flat-roofed dormers are a well-established feature of the area, on my site visit I observed no examples of balconies or similar projecting structures to surrounding properties.

6. The appeal scheme would therefore introduce an incongruous feature, made more conspicuous by the use of metal and glass for the balcony, materials that are not characteristic to the property. Spanning the full width of the dwelling, the balcony would also dominate the rear elevation of its host which, when combined with the existing extensions to the appeal property, would appear disproportionate to the modest scale of the original dwelling.
7. Accordingly, the proposal would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling. It would therefore conflict with Policy D1 of the Barnsley Local Plan (2019) (LP) which expects development to be of high-quality design and to respect, take advantage of and reinforce distinctive local character and features. It would also fail to accord with the guidance contained in the House Extensions and Other Domestic Alterations Supplementary Planning Document (2024) which states that proposals for domestic alterations should be of a scale and design which harmonises with the existing building, and seeks to ensure that raised platforms and associated screening do not have a detrimental effect on visual amenity or the character of the dwelling.

Living Conditions

8. The proposed balcony would incorporate obscure glazing to each side. Nonetheless it would afford occupiers of the host dwelling views into the rear garden of the attached dwelling at No 23. Owing to its height and close proximity to the shared boundary, the development would result in a greater level of overlooking than the existing dormer windows. This impact would be particularly evident to occupiers of No 23, given the modest size of their rear garden and the difference in site levels between the properties. As a result, the proposal would lead to an unacceptable loss of privacy for occupiers of No 23, to the detriment of their living conditions.
9. While I acknowledge that the proposed balcony would be of limited depth, the obscure-glazed end panel would add a perceptible sense of bulk when viewed from the rear garden of No 23. Along with the proximity of the proposal to No 23, this would have an overbearing effect on their outlook. In addition, the use of the balcony would give rise to increased levels of activity and associated noise, which, given the balcony's elevated position, would be more readily experienced by occupiers of No 23 than noise generated from the garden. Consequently, the proposal would further erode the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers.
10. Having regard to the proximity of the proposed balcony to No 23, the elevated position of the appeal site, and the path of the sun, the development would also be likely to reduce the amount of light reaching the nearest rear-facing window and part of the rear garden of No 23. Accordingly, the appeal scheme would give rise to overshadowing, further diminishing the living conditions for occupiers of that property.
11. For the above reasons, the proposed development would have an unacceptable effect on the living conditions of occupiers of No 23, with regards to privacy, outlook, noise and light. It would therefore conflict with Policy POLL1 of the LP which, amongst other things, requires that development does not result in an increase in noise which would unacceptably affect or cause a nuisance to people. It would also fail to accord with Policy GD1 of LP which requires that development

has no significant adverse effect on the living conditions and residential amenity of existing residents.

Other Matter

12. I note the appellant's comments regarding the officer recommendation and the subsequent refusal of planning permission in this case. However, I have no substantive evidence before me to suggest that planning procedures were not properly carried out. In any event, this does not change my findings with regard to the acceptability of the appeal scheme in relation to the main issues.

Conclusion and Recommendation

13. For the reasons set out above, the proposal would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and on the living conditions of occupiers of No 23. Therefore, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

S Jamieson

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

14. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

L C Hughes

INSPECTOR