The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 November 2016

by V Lucas-Gosnold LLB MCD MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 24th November 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/R4408/D/16/3160031
47 Upperwood Road, Darfield, Barnsley, S73 9RD

- 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 Mrs Linda Williams against the decision of Barnsley Metropolitan Borough Council.
- The application Ref 2016/0699, dated 13 June 2016, was refused by notice dated 7 September 2016.
- The development proposed is a first floor front extension.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. No. 47 is a detached dwelling situated on a large modern housing estate. The dwelling has a single storey element at the front of the property with a large lean too style roof. This is attached to the rear two storey element which has a small gable roof. The front facing roof slopes are unadorned apart from a central roof light.

4. The topography of the area is steeply sloping, with the ground levels falling away from Upperwood Road towards the rear of the appeal dwelling. Due to the land levels and the front boundary fence at No. 47, a large part of the front elevation of the dwelling is screened from public viewpoints in the highway. As a consequence of this, it is the roof slopes of the appeal dwelling that are mostly visible from the road and these are the dominant visual feature of the property. The appeal dwelling is also situated towards the top of a hill and it is therefore situated in a prominent position within the wider streetscene.

5. Due to its roof design in particular, No. 47 does have a somewhat unique appearance when contrasted with the other dwellings in the area which are largely characterised by bungalows and two storey dwellings situated on a mature housing estate. Whilst there are examples of gable fronted dwellings visible in the area this reflects the original design of those dwellings and the majority close to the appeal property are bungalows, such as those on Modena Court, which are viewed as a separate and visually cohesive group.

6. The neighbouring dwelling, No. 49, does have a two storey element at the rear which has been built into the sloping land levels. Notwithstanding this, when viewed from the highway it is the single storey front facing part of No. 49 that is largely visible and the dwelling therefore has the appearance of a bungalow. The dwelling is situated slightly higher up the hill than No. 47 and due to the difference in levels between the dwellings, the roof heights are seen as similar. They are also positioned close together and No. 49 also has an unadorned front facing roof slope. As a consequence of their proximity, similar height and simple front facing single storey roof slopes, the two dwellings are viewed together as relatively unobtrusive features in the streetscene.

7. The appeal proposal would see the construction of a first floor extension at the front of the dwelling. It would project forwards by approximately 3.9m and would sit within the plane of the roof slope of the single storey sloping roof element. The proposed materials used in the construction of the external surfaces would match those of the existing dwelling.

8. Whilst I appreciate that the appellant wishes to improve the design of the existing dwelling, it is viewed as a relatively unobtrusive feature in its current form and sits comfortably with neighbouring properties. The submitted plans show that the size of the proposed extension would result in it being seen as a large scale addition to the appeal dwelling. The proposal would also significantly detract from the simple roof form of the property which is the visually dominant feature of the dwelling and, as a consequence, it would disrupt the degree of visual cohesiveness that exists between No. 47 and the neighbouring property. As a consequence, the proposed extension would be would viewed as a dominant and discordant feature that would significantly detract from the appearance of the appeal dwelling itself and the character of the wider area.

9. Accordingly, I conclude on this issue that the development proposed would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area. The proposal would therefore conflict with policy CSP29 of the Barnsley Core Strategy (Adopted 2011) and the Council's Supplementary Planning Document on House Extensions (Adopted 2012) which together seek to ensure that development contributes to place making and is of high quality; and that front extensions are of a high standard of design and should not detract from the existing dwelling or the character of the streetscene.

Other Matters

10. I acknowledge that the appeal proposal is intended to provide additional living accommodation at the property. However this benefit does not outweigh the harm that I have identified above.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

V Lucas-Gosnold

INSPECTOR