

Application Reference: 2025/0060**Site Address:** 9 Magnolia Close, Shafton, Barnsley, S72 8RF**Introduction:**

This application seeks full planning permission for a first floor side extension, and raising of roof to form loft conversion, to 2 storey detached dwelling.

Relevant Site Characteristics

Located in an established residential area of Shafton, the dwelling is located in a somewhat set back position of a small cul-de-sac, which itself is contained with the centre of Park View, a circular road. The dwelling is set within a triangular plot which due to the adjacent alleyway located adjacent to the front, north facing elevation of the application dwelling makes the plot akin to a corner plot. Due to the shape of the plot, the side and rear garden features a diagonal boundary treatment which borders multiple dwellings. Consequently, the distance from the dwelling's rear elevation to the rear boundary extends from between 4m and 14m. Vehicle access to the cul-de-sac leads from the eastern section of Park View but additional pedestrian access to the western section of Park View is obtained via the alleyway.

The nine houses within Magnolia Close originally featured two distinct designs, the two semi-detached blocks to the east of the application dwelling are constructed of buff brick with prominent dark wood cladding and have side gable roofs. The five detached dwellings, including the application dwelling and those located at the opposite side of the alleyway are all constructed of buff brick with aspects of yellow stone or stone cladding, and feature tall gable roofs. All the detached dwellings, including the application dwelling appear to have been extended or altered from what is presumed to have originally been a set of five similar dwellings.

Site History

Application Reference	Description	Status (Approved/Refused)
B/93/1042/HR	Erection of attached garage/single storey extension to dwelling	Approved

Detailed description of Proposed Works

The proposal is to create in effect a 2.5 storey dwelling by building a first story extension on top of the existing attached ground floor garage, and the creation of a third floor of habitable accommodation within the roof space through raising the height, and extension (or replacement) of the main roof over the first-storey garage extension, creating a unified roof. The footprint of the first and effective second floors would have external measurements of approximately 26sqm each. The width of the proposal would match that of the garage at approximately 3.62m but the approximate length of 7.37m on both floors above would be approximately 1.44m shorter than the ground floor garage including an approximate 31 cm set

back from the original dwelling's front elevation. The proposed new eaves height for the combined dwelling would remain unchanged at 4.92m, but the ridge height increases by approximately 2.83m from 6.78m to 9.05m. For comparison, the original garage has an eaves and ridge height of 2.32m and 3.94m respectively. As part of the current garage extends beyond the original front elevation of the dwelling, the eaves and ridge heights would remain on the ground floor aspect of the garage, appearing as a front canopy, extending approximately 1.48m from the proposed two-storey extension and 1.17m from the dwelling's original front elevation. All measurements were taken on the west elevation of the submitted elevations plans.

Relevant policies

The Development Plan

Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires proposals to be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The development plan for Barnsley consists of the Barnsley Local Plan (adopted January 2019).

The Local Plan review was approved at the full Council meeting held 24th November 2022. The review determined that the Local Plan remains fit for purpose and is adequately delivering its objectives. This means, no updates to the Local Plan, in whole or in part, are to be carried out ahead of a further review. The next review is due to take place in 2027, or earlier, if circumstances require it.

The following Local Plan policies are relevant in this case:

- Policy SD1: Presumption in favour of Sustainable Development.
- Policy D1: High Quality Design and Place Making.
- Policy GD1: General Development.
- Policy T4: New Development and Transport Safety

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and the National Planning Practice Guidance

In December 2024, The Government published a revised National Planning Policy Framework ("NPPF") which is the most recent revision of the original Framework, published first in 2012 and updated a number of times, providing the overarching planning framework for England. It sets out the Government's planning policies for England and how they are expected to be applied. The NPPF must be taken into account in the preparation of local and neighbourhood plans and is a material consideration in planning decisions. This revised document has replaced the earlier planning policy statements, planning policy guidance and various policy letters and circulars, which are now cancelled.

Central to the NPPF is a presumption in favour of sustainable development which is at the heart of the framework (paragraph 10) and plans and decisions should apply this presumption in favour of sustainable development (paragraph 11). The NPPF confirms that there are three

dimensions to sustainable development: economic, social and environmental; each of these aspects are mutually dependent. The most relevant sections are:

Section 2 - Achieving sustainable development

Section 4 - Decision making

Section 12 - Achieving well-designed places

The National Design Guidance (2019) is a material consideration and sets out ten characteristics of well-designed places based on planning policy expectations. A written ministerial statement states that local planning authorities should take it into account when taking decisions.

Supplementary Planning Guidance

In line with the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012, Barnsley has adopted twenty eight Supplementary Planning Documents (SPDs) following the adoption of the Local Plan in January 2019. The most pertinent SPD's in this case are:

- House extensions and other domestic alterations
- Parking

The adopted SPDs should be treated as material considerations in decision making and are afforded full weight.

Consultations

The application has been advertised in accordance with Article 15 of the Town and Country Planning Development Management Procedure (England) Order 2015.

Any neighbour sharing a boundary with the site has been sent written notification and the application has been advertised on the Council website.

No representations have been received.

Shafton Parish Council: No comments have been received.

Planning Assessment

For the purposes of considering the balance in this application, the following planning weight is referred to in this report using the following scale:

- Substantial
- Considerable
- Significant
- Moderate
- Modest
- Limited
- Little or no

Principle

The site falls within Urban Fabric. Extensions and alterations to a domestic property are acceptable in principle provided that they remain subsidiary to the host dwelling, are of a scale and design which is appropriate to the host property and are not detrimental to the amenity afforded to adjacent properties.

Scale, Design and Impact on the Character

The proposal would not increase the footprint of the dwelling as all works would take place above the existing garage or within the proposed heightened roof space. In contrast to other dwellings within the cul-de-sac, the final dwelling would be larger but due to its unique set back position and with its bridging position between the wood clad dwellings and the brick and stone detached dwellings located across the alleyway, the dwelling would not appear significantly out of scale with the street scene. From the requested street scene plan, there is a literal peak height increase of approximately 1.62m, for a width of 3.62m above the adjacent semi-detached dwelling of No.7. For reference, the width of the bottom of the roofline is approximately 9.27m with a 32-degree incline compared to the original roof (excluding garage) of approximately 5.64m and an incline of 30.19-degrees. The other adjacent dwelling of No.8 is set at a right angle to the application dwelling on the opposite side of the alleyway. With a higher ground level, the increased ridge height difference between the dwellings is only 0.49m. The resulting roofline would result in some disparity between the dwellings, but with differing dwelling designs and an increased ground height opposite the alleyway, the resulting impact would be considered as moderate.

Following on from the scale of the dwelling the revised design of the dwelling also differs from that of its original style, but from a starting point of presumably identical or very similar detached dwellings within the street scene, each one has been altered or extended, diluting the original design and ultimately the character of each dwelling and that of the broader street scene. The proposal does not strictly adhere to the SPD House Extension and Other Domestic Extensions with the extension and its remodelled, and heightened roof becoming the dominant feature, instead of the original dwelling. In mitigation of this, the dwelling is somewhat isolated from similar styled dwellings which have also been impacted by alterations and extensions, and whilst the roof cannot allow for a step down, there is a set back included to demonstrate some subordination to the original dwelling in both the first and to an extent the second story of the proposal. Overall whilst the design and character of the dwelling would be altered, the overall design, especially with the removal of proposed render and instead used of matching materials is acceptable, and primarily due to its position within the street would be deemed to have a modest impact design and character of the dwelling and street scene.

As the height of the dwelling would be a significant factor of the proposal, consideration must be given to the impact of the proposal within the broader area. Probably the most prominent view of the application dwelling would be from Park View at the junction of Magnolia Close. From this view, the incline of Magnolia Close is clearly visible with No.8, adjacent to the alleyway being the most prominent dwelling. The proposed changes to the application dwelling would broadly bring the dwelling in line with the height of No.8, so the impact would be minimal and not overtly out of character with the street scene. The dwellings to the rear of Magnolia Close on the western section of Park View are all set at a higher ground level. With some larger separation distances between dwellings on Park View, the application dwelling would be most visible between No.7 to No.11 and No.17 & No.19. For the latter, it would be the rear elevation, which is most prominent, whilst from No.7 to No.11, which also includes the alleyway, the western side elevation would be most prominent. For all these views, there will be a noticeable difference between what is visible now and what is proposed, but that difference is not expected to be obtrusive or out of character with the higher level houses on Park View or with the view of Magnolia Close as a whole, aided again by the height of No.8. It would therefore be considered that the impact within the broader street scene would be considered as modest.

Impact on Neighbouring Amenity

With the location, position and distance from neighbouring dwellings, it would not be expected that the proposal would have a detrimental effect on overshadowing of any neighbouring dwelling. Therefore, for the potential issue of overshadowing the impact would be considered as limited.

The House Extension and Other Domestic Extensions SPD requires that minimum distances are maintained between directly facing windows or windows facing a blank elevation. In this proposal four windows would require assessment. For all windows, measurements are approximate and taken from the centre of the window indicated on the plans. Starting with the front elevation of the proposal, the first storey window of the two-storey extension would only overlook Magnolia Close and front gardens, not directly into any other window, with a straight line hitting the corner wall of No.4 at distance 28m. The second storey window may directly overlook a window of No.4 but again at a distance of 28m. Both front windows would meet the minimum separation distance of 21m for facing windows within a first story extension or those within a roof space, as the second storey window is. For the front elevation windows, there would be little or no impact on neighbour amenity.

For the rear windows, additional SPD Guidance arises as a 10m distance should be maintained between two (or more) story extensions and the rear boundary treatment. Starting with the proposed first storey window within the extension, the window would only have a distance to the rear boundary of 6m although a straight-line distance of 26m to the side elevation to No. 17 Park View is maintained. From the second story window, a larger 8.74m distance is achieved to the rear boundary, and 28m to rear elevation of No.17 Park View is maintained. Whilst both windows meet the minimum standards in relation to distance between windows or a blank elevation, both fail on distance to the rear boundary. In mitigation, an obscured glazed, first-

storey window has been agreed, to protect the amenity of neighbouring gardens to the rear of the application dwelling. For the second storey window, with a larger distance to the rear boundary, the distance being closer to the required 10m, and with a smaller window size, essentially located within the original, although extended aspect of the original house, discretion has been used to allow this window not to have obscured glazing as the impact on neighbouring amenity would not be considered sufficiently detrimental to refuse the window or overall proposal, especially with no neighbour representations being received. For reference, if the window had been located wholly within the fabric of the existing dwelling, it would have been allowed through Permitted Development legislation. With the proposed first storey window featuring obscured glazing, the impact would be considered to have little or no impact on neighbouring amenity. However, the second storey window within the proposed new roof of the existing dwelling would be considered to have a modest impact on residential amenity.

Highways

Whilst bedroom number are increased, with no increase to the footprint of the dwelling, the existing parking provision and access would remain unchanged. The garage may be used for parking a car but both its existing and unchanged size would remain inadequate to be considered as a formal parking space. With existing parking provision unchanged and with local policy only requiring a minimum of two parking spaces within the curtilage for dwellings with three or more bedrooms, there would be little or no impact on parking provision or highway safety.

Planning Balance and Conclusion

For the reasons given above, and taking all other matters into consideration, the proposal complies with the relevant plan policies and planning permission should be granted subject to necessary conditions. Under the provisions of the NPPF, the application is considered to be a sustainable form of development and is therefore recommended for approval.

RECOMMENDATION: Approve subject to conditions

Justification

STATEMENT OF COMPLIANCE WITH ARTICLE 35 OF THE TOWN AND COUNTRY DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT PROCEDURE ORDER 2015

It was necessary to make contact with the applicant to request further information about the proposed materials for use within the development. The applicant had already decided to revert to materials of a similar appearance with revised plans submitted. A proposed street scene plan was also requested to assist in assessment of the proposed roof height increase. Finally it was

agreed that a condition for obscured glazing on the first floor, rear elevation window within proposed extension was required to protect amenity of residential dwellings to the rear of the application dwelling.

Due regard has been given to Article 8 and Protocol 1 of Article 1 of the European Convention for Human Rights Act 1998 when considering objections, the determination of the application and the resulting recommendation. it is considered that the recommendation will not interfere with the applicant's and/or any objector's right to respect for his private and family life, his home and his correspondence.