The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 November 2019

by William Walton BA MSc Dip Env Law LLM CPE BVC MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 3 March 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/R4408/D/19/3234952
66 Dove Road, Wombwell, Barnsley S73 0TE

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant full planning permission.
- The appeal is made by Mr C. Murphy against the decision of Barnsley Metropolitan Borough Council.
- The application Ref 2019/0513, dated 18 April 2019, was refused by notice dated 28 June 2019.
- The development proposed is a first-floor front extension.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issue relevant to this appeal is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site comprises a detached dwelling on a housing estate in Wombwell, near Barnsley. The dwelling occupies a slightly elevated position above Dove Road with a sloping driveway. Since its initial construction in the 1970s the dwelling, like some of its neighbours, has been extended from the front at ground floor level so that it now incorporates a garage and additional living space. The roof above this extension slopes gently to the original elevation and is constructed of what appeared to be curved concrete roof tiles. At first floor level, looking to the front, are three regularly spaced large windows.

4. Each of the detached properties immediately to the east of the appeal property (nos. 60-64) has a broadly similar ground floor projection. Those to the west also have some form of ground floor extension. On the opposite side of the road the properties are semi-detached, some of which incorporate porches and garages. Most of the houses have front driveways and front gardens.

5. The appellant is proposing to construct an extension at first floor level above the front entrance in order to provide additional space in the front bedroom and an en-suite bathroom. It would incorporate a front facing gable set back slightly from the existing ground floor elevation with a gently pitched roof. It would extend just over half-way along the front of the house. It would include a front window slightly larger than the existing three at first floor level and a

small side window facing west. As a result of the development, two of the original first floor front three windows would be removed.

6. During my visit I did not see any other dwellings with a first-floor front extension within the immediate neighbourhood. I note that the Council's Supplementary Planning Document: House Extensions and Other Domestic Alterations (May 2019) (SPD) suggests that first floor extensions can be permissible where they complement the original dwelling and do not adversely affect the street scene. I consider that the extension would be subservient to the original structure and would therefore complement the existing dwelling.

7. I acknowledge the argument advanced by the appellant's agent that there is some variation in the form which extensions have taken amongst the neighbouring properties. Nevertheless, I consider that the introduction of an extension at first floor level at no. 66 would disrupt the overall harmony of the properties along that section of Dove Road.

8. I find that the proposal might establish an unwanted precedent. Whilst each application and appeal must be treated on its merits, I can appreciate the Council's concern that approval of this proposal could be used in support of other similar proposals in the future. This is a realistic concern since there are a many similar properties in the neighbourhood. Consequently, allowing this appeal could make it harder to resist further planning applications for similar proposals, the cumulative effect would be to exacerbate the harm I have found above.

9. I acknowledge the agent's observation that the neighbourhood is not part of a conservation area. However, the Council's adopted development plan seeks to protect neighbourhoods such as Dove Road against harmful development. Whilst I accept that the proposal would not dominate the host building I consider that it would harm the character and appearance of the neighbourhood.

10. Consequently, I find that the proposal would conflict with Policy D1 of the Barnsley Local Plan (2019) which seeks to encourage high quality design and place making. It would also conflict Paragraph 130 of the Framework which seeks to protect the character and appearance of neighbourhoods. I acknowledge that it would not conflict with the Council's SPD.

Other Matters

11. I acknowledge the argument advanced by the agent that the additional living space is needed to accommodate the appellant's family requirements. However, this does not outweigh my concerns with respect to the visual effect which the proposal would have on the neighbouring properties.

12. I also note that there were no letters of objection submitted by neighbours and that there was 1 letter of support.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons set out above I dismiss this appeal.

William Walton

INSPECTOR