



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 May 2019

by Paul Cooper MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 29 May 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/R4408/D/19/3223900

The Ashtrees, Black Moor Farm, Black Moor, Snowden Hill, Barnsley S36 8YR

- 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 Scott Wright against the decision of Barnsley Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 2018/1337, dated 19 October 2018, was refused by notice dated 13 February 2019.
 - The development proposed is stone built detached summer house.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. As the appeal site is within the Green Belt, the main issues are:
 - whether the proposal would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt;
 - the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area; and

Reasons

Inappropriate development

3. The appeal property is a large two storey barn conversion, set within a large site, in a remote rural location. The property forms one of a number of buildings to be converted to dwellings, in various states of reconstruction. The appeal proposal would co
4. The National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) states that inappropriate development is harmful to the Green Belt. All proposals for development in the Green Belt should be treated as inappropriate, and thus should be approved only if very special circumstances exist, unless they come within one of the categories in the closed list of exceptions in either paragraph 145 or 146 of the Framework.
5. The Council have assessed the detached outbuilding as an extension to the existing dwelling, which is covered as an exception within paragraph 145 c) of the Framework which states "*provided that it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building*"
6. The Council have provided calculations to demonstrate the size of the extension in relation to the original dwelling and consider that the size of the extension would clearly be much less than the dimension which would be allowed. I

concur with this evidence and as such, the proposal is not inappropriate development as set out in the Framework.

7. As I have not found the proposal to be inappropriate development, then the proposals are not regarded as harmful to the openness of the Green Belt, as set out in *Lee Valley Regional Park Authority, R (on the application of) v Epping Forest District Council & Anor (Rev 1) [2016] EWCA Civ 404*. I will therefore not consider this matter any further.

Character and appearance

8. The existing property has a strong rectangular emphasis, which is sought to be replicated by the appeal proposal. The summerhouse would be located within 1m of the existing property but would be set at ninety degree to the main dwelling, with a considerable amount of the structure located forward of the front elevation.
9. The substantial dimensions of the appeal proposal would represent a large addition to the host dwelling which would not appear consistent with the architectural layout of that dwelling, sitting forward of the front elevation with a roof design and pitch that would not architecturally complement the existing dwelling. Overall, I find that the design of the appeal proposal would not integrate well with the existing dwelling and not respect its original character.
10. As a result, the appeal proposal is harmful to the character and appearance of the area, and therefore contrary to Policy GB2 of the Barnsley Local Plan which states that the replacement, extension and alteration of existing buildings in the Green Belt will be allowed, provided that they do not have a harmful impact on the appearance or character. This approach is bolstered by Policy D1 which states that development should be of high-quality design and amongst other matters, reinforce local character.

Other Matters

11. I note the concerns of the appellant regarding other applications that appear to have been permitted. The full circumstances of these other cases are not before me, and I have considered this appeal proposal on its own merits and concluded that it would cause harm for the reasons set out.
12. I also note the frustrations of the appellant in relation to the application process and the advice given by the Council. However, I can only take into consideration the appeal proposals that are in front of me. Any dissatisfaction with the Council's approach could be taken up with the appropriate complaints procedure of the Council.

Conclusion

13. For the above reasons, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Paul Cooper

INSPECTOR