



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 January 2022

by G Bayliss BA (Hons) MA MA MRTPI IHBC

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20 January 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/R4408/D/21/3279956

115 Intake Crescent, Dodworth, Barnsley S75 3NL

- 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 Alexander Graf von der Pahlen against the decision of Barnsley Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 2020/1047, dated 15 September 2020, was refused by notice dated 9 July 2021.
 - The development proposed is the construction of front porch with total foot print area of 4.5 square metres (2.84 square metres internal space). Walls to be 100 mm thick cavity construction. Floor insulation. Roof insulation. Roof to match construction style of existing main building. New roof drainage to connect to a buried soakaway crate.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal building is a semi-detached, two storey dwelling within a residential estate, fronting Intake Crescent. Its position is slightly elevated from the road, set back behind a small front garden, bounded by low wall, and is prominently viewed from the surrounding roads. Within the immediate area there is a consistency to the design, form and materials of the buildings, the latter being predominantly red brick walling and tiled roofs. Some buildings have rendering to the first floor, but again there is a consistency to its application. Small, subservient additions feature on a number of local buildings including front porches, and these are predominantly built in matching brick.
4. The walling for the proposed porch is to be faced in natural stone. I note, however, that in the appeal statement the appellant is proposing to vary the walling materials to a combination of brick and natural stone, with an illustration showing brick used to edge the stone walling. However, the elevation drawings submitted with the application have not been amended to incorporate this detail and the design intention is therefore unclear.
5. Irrespective of the uncertainty as to whether the walling of the porch is to be constructed in stone or a combination of stone and brick, I consider that the use of mainly stone for such a prominent addition would be an inappropriate building material within an estate of predominantly brick buildings. The porch

would make a jarring contrast to the host building and would be a highly noticeable feature in the streetscene. The visual harm would be exacerbated by the digging down to the side of the porch to create the parking area which would make the porch, together with the steps and side walling, a much more prominent, discordant feature.

6. I note the appellant's wish to create a feature effect for a 'cottage aesthetic' but this level of individualisation is not appropriate for a residential area with a cohesive identity and a consistency in materials.
7. The appeal scheme would therefore cause harm to the character and appearance of the area. Accordingly, it would conflict with policy D1 of the Barnsley Local Plan (2019) and the Supplementary Planning Document 'House Extensions and Other Domestic Alterations' (2019). This policy and the guidance, amongst other things, require that front extensions are of a high standard of design and will not be acceptable where they detract from the quality of the existing dwelling or character of the street scene. It would also be contrary to the high-quality design expectations of Section 12 of the 2021 National Policy Framework.

Other Matters

8. The appellant has highlighted properties within the surrounding area which utilise render as well as brick, and a property which incorporates some stone walling. However, I have already acknowledged above that render is part of the accepted palette of building materials. The building which incorporates stone walling is set back from the estate buildings, of different design, and not a prominent part of the street scene. I am not, therefore, minded to allow the appeal in the light of this.
9. The appellant raises concerns over the conduct of the Council during the application process. Such concerns should normally be addressed through the Council's own complaints service in the first instance.

Conclusion

10. The appeal scheme would conflict with the development plan. There are no material considerations worthy of sufficient weight that would indicate a decision other than in accordance with it. The appeal should therefore be dismissed.

G Bayliss

INSPECTOR

