

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 October 2018

by N McGurk BSc (Hons) MCD MBA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14th November 2018

Appeal Ref: APP/R4408/D/18/3209327
60 Manchester Road, Thurlstone, S36 9QT

- 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 David Cooke against the decision of Barnsley Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 2018/0462, dated 20 March 2018, was refused by notice dated 7 June 2018.
 - The development proposed is a house extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The development proposed is described in more detail on the decision notice, "Erection of first floor side extension to dwelling."
3. The appeal property was constructed further to being granted planning permission in 2002¹. A subsequent application² for a single storey extension was then approved and development has commenced on the development thus permitted.

Main Issue

4. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the Thurlstone Conservation Area.

Reasons

5. The appeal property is a stone-built, end terrace dwelling, forming part of a row of similar terraced houses. The property has a single storey element to the side, which, during the time of the site visit, appeared to be in the process of being extended, further to the approval under 2016/0866, referred to above.
6. The appeal property fronts the pavement alongside Manchester Road and in response to the local topography, is two stories high at the front and three stories high to the rear.

¹ Ref: B/02/0515/PU.

² Ref: 2016/0866.

7. The property is located within Thurlstone Conservation Area, which in this location is largely characterised by the presence of stone-built terraced dwellings fronting the pavement along both sides of Manchester Road. Dwellings tend to be two stories in height as they front Manchester Road, although a few dwellings have a second floor of accommodation apparent to their front elevations, with windows in dormers or front gables.
8. Much of the attractive quality of the Conservation Area derives from the presence of period properties and a sense of uniformity derived from the predominant use of stone and the modest proportions and active front elevations of dwellings. Fenestration adds a satisfying sense of active domesticity, whereby doors and windows provide visual interest and large blank sections of stone-work are generally avoided.
9. During my site visit, I observed there to be more variety in built-form across the wider area, including the presence of a detached dwelling set partly below road level to the east of the appeal property and the presence of commercial uses and flats further along the road. However, these features do not tend to detract unduly from the attractive, period and uniform qualities that predominate.
10. The proposed development would result in a first floor extension over the single storey side part of the property, including the recently approved extension. The proposal would not be set back from the existing front elevation and would incorporate a pitched roof that would extend to the existing ridge height, without any set down. A single window, at first storey height, is also proposed.
11. Taking all of the above into account, I find that the proposed development would result in an extension that would appear as a large and unduly bulky addition. The absence of any set back, or set down would lead the proposal to draw attention to itself as a visually intrusive feature. It would result in an addition that would, to some considerable degree, appear so dominant as to subsume the host property, rather than appear in harmony with and subordinate to it.
12. Further, I find that the harm arising from the above would be exacerbated as a result of the proposed fenestration to the front elevation, which would result in a largely blank area of stone work, with just a single first floor window, appearing awkward and isolated within a large expanse of stone-work. This would contrast with the more active domestic frontages of neighbouring properties which make a positive contribution to the Conservation Area's attributes.
13. Consequently, I consider that the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the Thurlstone Conservation Area. This would be contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), to Barnsley Local Development Framework Core Strategy (2011) policies CSP29 and CSP30, and to the Council's Supplementary Planning Document, House Extensions (2012), which together amongst other things, protect local character.
14. Rather than make the positive contribution desired by paragraph 192 of the Framework, the proposal harms local character. The harm caused would be significant in terms of the immediate context of the proposal, but is less than

substantial in the context of the Thurlstone Conservation Area as a whole. In these circumstances, paragraph 195 of the Framework requires the harm to be weighed against any public benefit.

15. The proposal would not result in any public benefits that would outweigh the identified harm to the Thurlstone Conservation Area, a designated heritage asset.

Conclusion

16. For the reasons given above, the appeal does not succeed.

N McGurk

INSPECTOR