



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 May 2023

**by R Jones BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 20<sup>th</sup> June 2023**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/R4408/D/23/3318802**

**3 Hall Place, Monk Bretton, Barnsley S71 2EX**

- 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 Tony Lees against the decision of Barnsley Metropolitan Borough Council.
  - The application Ref 2022/0937, dated 6 July 2022, was refused by notice dated 23 January 2023.
  - The development proposed is erection of single storey side/rear extension and erection of chimney stack positioned on roof plane of the extension.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for erection of single storey side/rear extension and erection of chimney stack positioned on roof plane of the extension at 3 Hall Place, Monk Bretton, Barnsley S71 2EX in accordance with the terms of the application, 2022/0937, dated 6 July 2022, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:
  - 1) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Site Plan, Location Plan, Elevations (Revision B); and Floor Plans and Elevations (Revision C).

### Procedural Matter

2. The description of development used in the banner heading above has been taken from the Council's decision notice as it explicitly refers to the chimney stack and is, therefore, a more accurate description of the development than provided in the planning application form.
3. The Council have raised no concerns in respect of the single storey side/rear extension or the alterations to the form and arrangement of the roof. I have no reason to take a different view and have duly only considered the chimney stack, which I saw on my site visit has been built.

### Main Issue

4. The main issue in this case is the effect of the chimney stack on the character and appearance of the host bungalow and streetscene.

### Reasons

5. No.3 Hall Place (No.3) is a detached bungalow located on the corner of Hall Place and Church Grove, off Cross Street. Set on the rear part of the southern

roof plane of the new single storey rear/side extension is a chimney stack that provides extract from a fireplace in the lounge. The chimney stack is brick built, around 0.8m in depth and is a height of around 1.5m from the roof plane (or 1.6m including the flue).

6. Although higher than the ridge of the host bungalow and prominent on the corner as you enter Hall Place from Cross Street, I did not find the chimney to be a particularly incongruous feature or excessive relative to the significant scale of the extended roof of the bungalow. The chimney stack has a functional appearance, but this does not equate to poor design, and the use of brick means it assimilates with its host. Further, I did not find the chimney stack to be out of keeping with the surrounding area and streetscene, which I observed on my site visit is characterised by a mix of dwelling types and styles, and includes chimney stacks of various sizes and design.
7. Irrespective of whether the dimensions of the chimney are a requirement of Building Regulations, I conclude that the chimney stack causes no harm to the character and appearance of the host bungalow or the wider streetscene. It does not therefore conflict with Policy D1 of the Barnsley Local Plan (2019) or paragraph 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework which both expect development to be of high quality design that respects, or is sympathetic to, local character.

### **Conditions**

8. The planning application was not made retrospectively, but it was clear from my site visit that the works had already been completed and that drawings were amended during the course of determination of the planning application. Therefore, for the avoidance of any doubt, I find it necessary in this case to attach a condition that specifies the approved drawings.

### **Conclusion**

9. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

*R. Jones*

INSPECTOR