
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 February 2025

by **Paul Martinson BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11 March 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/R4408/D/25/3359585

51A Huddersfield Road, Barnsley S75 1DR

- 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 Dominic Bottomley against the decision of Barnsley Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 2024/0949.
 - The development proposed is Alterations to roof and conversion of loft into habitable space and erection of front porch.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The appeal site lies within the Huddersfield Road Conservation Area. I have therefore had special regard to section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the Act).

Main Issue

3. The main issue is whether the proposed development would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Huddersfield Road Conservation Area (the CA).

Reasons

4. The CA comprises primarily of the wide thoroughfare of Huddersfield Road and the narrower adjoining residential streets. Huddersfield Road is lined with predominantly large, detached, semi-detached and terraced housing including several grand Victorian villas and fine individual residences on large plots. Walling materials comprise of a mix of brick and stone and the majority of the development dates to the nineteenth and early to mid-twentieth centuries with occasional more recent development. Gabled, dual pitched roof forms are common whilst some buildings feature hipped roofs or hipped roof detailing. Buildings are typically set back from the road behind front gardens.
5. Pertinent to the appeal, the significance of the CA is derived from the distinctive nineteenth and twentieth century architecture, the wide, open nature of Huddersfield Road contrasting with its narrower side streets, and the variety in the streetscene, arising from the different designs, ages, materials, building heights and roof forms.
6. 51A is one of a pair of hip-roofed, mid-twentieth century, semi-detached brick-built dwellings fronting Huddersfield Road. The pair of dwellings are well-balanced and

exhibit a high degree of symmetry with similar fenestration pattern, matching bay windows, brick detailing, recessed porches, projecting gables and unbroken, hipped roofs. 51A has been extended sensitively at single storey level to the side elevation. The hipped roof of this addition reinforces the character of the pair of semi-detached dwellings. As one of this attractive, well-balanced pair of mid-twentieth century dwellings, the appeal property contributes positively to the character and appearance of the CA and reinforces its significance.

7. The proposed loft conversion would lead to the formation of a gable in place of the existing hipped roof and a large dormer window to the rear elevation. The resulting gable would be a highly visible alteration to the front elevation that would unbalance the careful composition of the pair of semi-detached dwellings, eroding their shared symmetry. As such, seen alongside the existing adjoining dwelling, this proposal would represent an incongruous addition at odds with the character and appearance of No 51A and No 51B.
8. As the proposal would result in harm to a pair of semi-detached dwellings that makes a positive contribution to the varied character and appearance of the CA, I therefore conclude that the proposal would fail to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the CA. This is contrary to the requirements of section 72(1) of the Act. As such, the proposal would be harmful to the significance of this designated heritage asset.
9. Paragraph 212 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) sets out that, when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation. Any harm should require clear and convincing justification. Given the extent and nature of the proposed development, I find that the harm in this instance is 'less than substantial' but, nevertheless, of considerable importance and weight. Under such circumstances, Paragraph 215 advises that this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal, including, where appropriate, securing the asset's optimum viable use.
10. The appellant argues that the proposal would preserve the building's use and secure its long-term upkeep. However, I have not been provided with any evidence that the use of the building is under threat or that the condition of the building has deteriorated to such an extent as to require the proposed development to prevent further decline. I accept that there would be personal benefits to the appellant in terms of providing additional living accommodation, avoiding the need for a potential future house move, however, this is a personal, not public, benefit. Any economic benefits arising from the construction phase would be inherently limited by the small-scale nature of the scheme. Overall, these limited public benefits do not outweigh the harm I have identified above.
11. For the above reasons, the proposal would fail to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the CA and would be harmful to its significance. This is contrary to the requirements of section 72(1) of the Act and the provisions within the Framework which seek to conserve and enhance the historic environment. The harmful impact is also contrary to Policies D1 and HE1 of the Barnsley Local Plan (2019) which together seek to conserve and enhance heritage assets and ensure new development is of a high-quality design that complements the local townscape.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above I dismiss the appeal.

Paul Martinson

INSPECTOR