



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 December 2025

by **L Wilson BA (Hons) MA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15 December 2025

Appeal Ref: 6001133

2 Berry Drive, Royston, Barnsley S71 4GB

- 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 Adam Shaw against the decision of Barnsley Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 2025/0714.
 - The development was originally described as proposed extension and loft conversion.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The proposed development includes a wraparound extension as well as a loft conversion with dormer window. The reason for refusal relates to solely the wraparound extension, and both main parties agree that the dormer window could be implemented using permitted development rights. Therefore, the main issue is the effect of the proposed wraparound extension on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The host dwelling is a two-storey, detached dwelling of simple design. The northern elevation (herein referred to as the front elevation) contains the main architectural features and the main entrance to the house which faces the adjacent public open space. It is located within a residential area with a mix of dwelling designs, yet they share a consistent scale, form and character.
4. The wraparound extension is designed with a pitched roof, as well as matching materials and window proportions. Given that the extension is single-storey, the eaves and ridge height would be below the existing roofline. The appellant sets out that the proposal would provide much needed family living space and is consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework's (the Framework) objectives of efficient land use and high-quality design.
5. The wrap-around extension would appear overly dominant and detract from the simple character and form of the original dwelling due to its siting, height, scale and design. Thus, the extension would not complement the original house and would detract from the front elevation of the host dwelling. Similarly, it would be out of keeping with the simple character and form of dwellings in the locality. The boundary fence would provide partial screening; however, due to the extension's

height, it would be visible from the surrounding area, and especially the adjacent public open space.

6. Some dwellings in the local area have been extended, including linking garages to the main house. Having said that, extensions of the type proposed are uncharacteristic of the locality, particularly on more visible corner plots adjacent to the public open space area, such as the appeal site.
7. For these reasons, the proposed wraparound extension would have an unacceptable effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area. Consequently, it would conflict with Policy D1 of the Barnsley Local Plan (2019). This states that development is expected to be of high quality design which should respect and reinforce local character.
8. The proposal would also conflict with paragraphs 7.10 and 7.11 of the Council's House Extensions and Other Domestic Alterations Supplementary Planning Document (2024). These seek to ensure front extensions are in keeping with the style of the existing dwelling, must complement the original house and not adversely affect the street scene. In addition, it would conflict with paragraph 139 of the Framework which states that development that is not well designed should be refused, especially where it fails to reflect local design policies.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given above, having considered the development plan as a whole, the approach in the Framework, and all other material considerations, the appeal does not succeed.

L Wilson

INSPECTOR