



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 January 2021

by R Hitchcock BSc(Hons) DipCD MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15 January 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/R4408/D/20/3259136

9 Haldane Close, Brierley, Barnsley S72 9LL

- 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 Mr Chris Bingham against the decision of Barnsley Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 2020/0354, dated 27 March 2020, was refused by notice dated 7 August 2020.
 - The development proposed is a single storey extension to front and first floor extension to side.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a ground floor and two-storey extension to front and side, and first floor side extension at 9 Haldane Close, Brierley, Barnsley S72 9LL in accordance with the terms of planning application ref 2020/0354, dated 27 March 2020, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plan: AH0249/3 Rev.B.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Preliminary Matter

2. The description in the banner heading above is taken from the application form and the Council's decision notice. It is the description used to notify third parties. However, although those described elements form part of the proposal, it also includes an element better described as a 'two-storey extension' forward of the existing garage which is not explicit in the description.
3. This element of the extension formed part of the single unamended proposal considered by the Council and was clearly part of the consolidated extension shown on the submitted plans. Notwithstanding the description, any third party viewing the proposed plans would have a clear understanding of the full extent of the scale, form and position of the extension; I therefore consider no party will be prejudiced by my consideration of the appeal without recourse to further consultation with third parties.

Main Issues

4. The main issues are the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the dwelling and its locality within the Brierley Conservation Area (BCA).

Reasons

5. The site lies close to the turning head of a residential cul-de-sac of detached houses. The two-storey dwelling with attached single storey garage is finished in buff brick and concrete tiled roof and is set well back in its plot. Aside from a projecting bay, the front elevation mirrors the adjacent property at 7 Haldane Close and features an asymmetrical roof design and truncated front corner to expose full height brickwork to an extending length of ridge of the rear roof slope above the main entrance.
6. The cul-de-sac is located at the edge of the BCA which is characterised by dispersed vernacular local stone buildings of varying stature. These original settlement and farming buildings are intertwined by later brick-built development and some more recent infill.
7. The proposal is made up of a combined first-floor extension over the garage and a two storey element forward of it to align with the main part of the existing front elevation. A single storey projection, accommodating the main entrance and new garage door, is proposed forward of part of the existing front elevation and that formed by the two storey extension.
8. Although the main body of the extensions would mask a distinctive element of the design of the existing dwelling and one shared with other buildings on the Close, it would result in a form of development that is consistent with some of the other house types on the cul-de-sac. Additionally, the single storey element of the proposals would reflect the design of the existing canopy over the front door and that of other main entrances and garage doors close by.
9. The resultant massing of the building would be greater than other buildings on the Close, however, the higher degree of spaciousness about the building afforded by the open aspect to the rear and side space would temper any perception of increased scale and terracing would not result. Furthermore, despite its elevated position, full views of the entirety of the building are not possible from the Close other than the nearest turning head. This is on account of the length of the plot frontage and position of the dwelling substantially behind 11 Haldane Close.
10. Save for the requirement for old and new facing brick to be stitched together on the rear elevation and upper part of the front elevation, the flush alignments of the first floor and two-storey elements of the scheme would deny the appearance of the proposal as an extension. This approach would not provide a subservient form of development as advocated in the Council's House Extensions and Other Domestic Alterations Supplementary Planning Document [2019] (SPD). However, given the minor role that the building plays in the streetscene and limited ability to view it as a singularity in that context, I do not consider the preferred approach of the SPD to be compelling in the particular circumstances of the case.
11. The proposed flush alignments of the first floor and two-storey elements of the proposal would require old and new facing brick to be stitched together on the

rear elevation and upper part of the front elevation. This approach could result in a poor standard of finish if new materials are not a close match to the existing weathered finishes.

12. The appellant has directed me to an example of an extension at No11. In terms of facing brickwork, that development did not result in the same bonding requirement on account of the buttressed corners of the property design; it also pre-dated the recent SPD. Nevertheless, it provides an example as to the potential effect of material matching and demonstrates that the light hue of the brickwork alongside opportunities to use redundant roofing materials from the existing garage are such that the effect would not be significant. Taken with the very minor role of the building within the streetscene, any effect on the visual amenity and quality of the locality would be so negligible as to not warrant a refusal of planning permission.
13. Having regard to the above and the duty imposed under s 72(1) of the Town and Country Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, I find the fact that the site lies within a modern self-contained development which contributes little to the historic significance of the locality, the proposal would have a neutral effect on the character and appearance of the BCA. Although development within the cul-de-sac provides part of the setting of other development of significance within the BCA, there would be only limited glimpses of the proposed extension in that context whereupon no demonstrable harm would arise.
14. For those reasons, I find that the proposed extensions would preserve the quality of built development in the locality and utilise a design that reflects local character and form. It would preserve the character and appearance of the Brierley Conservation Area and therefore align with Policies D1 and HE1 of the Barnsley Local Plan [2019] as they seek to achieve high quality design that complements the local character and setting of distinctive places whilst protecting designated heritage assets.

Conditions

15. I have considered the suggested conditions from the Council and had regard to Paragraph 55 of the National Planning Policy Framework and the National Planning Practice Guidance in terms of the use of planning conditions. In addition to the standard condition limiting the lifespan of the planning permission, I have imposed a condition specifying the relevant drawings as this provides certainty. A condition requiring the use of matching external surfaces is necessary and reasonable in the interest of the character and appearance of the locality and the BCA.

Conclusion

16. For the above reasons, the appeal should be allowed.

R Hitchcock

INSPECTOR