
2024/0427

Applicant: Mrs Allemby

Address: 48 Broomhead Road, Wombwell, Barnsley, S73 0SB

Description: Erection of 2 storey side and single storey rear extensions and install of block paving to front to replace existing lawn, to 2 storey semi-detached dwelling.

Site & Location Description:

Located in the northwest of Wombwell town centre, the application dwelling sits with a street of varied style dwellings and intersect with small cul-de-sacs. Although some semi-detached houses and detached bungalows feature on the street, the application dwelling is part of one of the many terraced blocks. Specifically, the dwelling is a red brick terraced house with a hipped roof and features both ground and first-floor bay windows. Many dwellings within the area have been extended but there only appears to be two similar side extensions to the one proposed, one at No.2, and the other opposite the application dwelling at No.27.



Planning History: None

Proposed:

The proposal is for a two-story side extension, running for the length of the side extension, with an attached single-story rear extension which extends slightly in width onto the original rear elevation of the dwelling. New front and rear windows are proposed within the extension, along with a set of glazed doors opening into the garden on the ground floor rear extension, no side windows are proposed. Additional works are proposed in the front garden to increase parking provision.

Approximate Measurements:

All existing roof and eaves heights have been checked on the existing plans and remain unaltered on the proposed plans. As there is no proposed set down, the side extensions roof and eaves height match those of the original dwelling.

Plot size:

Area: 230 sqm

Max. Width: 8.6m

Max. Length: 27m

**Max. Width Side Elevation to
Boundary: 3.8m**

Side Extension

- **Side Projection: 3.53m**
- **Length: 10.32m**
- **Eaves Height: 5.73m**
- **Roof height: 8.28m**

Rear Extension

- **Projection: 3.32m**
- **Width: 4.26m**
- **Eaves Height: 2.55m**
- **Roof height: 3.9m**

Combined Extension

- **Length: 10.32m**
- **Side Projection: 3.35m**
- **Max. Eaves Height: 5.73m**
- **Max. Roof height: 8.28m**

Existing and Proposed Floor Plans and Elevations



Local Plan Designation: Urban Fabric

Conservation Area: No

Neighbour Representations:

Letters were sent to nearby addresses; No comments were received.

Consultees:

Forestry Officer: The forestry officer confirmed that as the shrubs/trees are proposed to be removed, rather than retained, no tree protection measures, or other conditions are required.

Highways Drainage: Confirmed that Yorkshire would require consultation and may have objections before any decision is made.

Yorkshire Water: Provided an initial consultation response highlighting the issues raised by Highways Drainage, and potential solutions. The applicant and their agent continued to liaise with Yorkshire Water and have now provided confirmation that a H4 S185 Agreement in relation to proposed works has been created.

Highways: The proposals are acceptable, subject to conditions being added to any decision, as whilst the number of bedrooms is increasing from two to three, additional parking space, enough for two vehicles is proposed within the front garden.

Policy Context

Planning decisions should be made in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise and the NPPF does not change the statutory status of the development plan as the starting point for decision making. The Local Plan was adopted in January 2019 and is also now accompanied by seven masterplan frameworks which apply to the largest site allocations (housing, employment, and mixed-use sites). In addition, the Council has adopted a series of Supplementary Planning Documents and Neighbourhood Plans which provide supporting guidance and specific local policies and are a material consideration in the decision-making process.

The Local Plan review was approved at the full Council meeting on 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.

NPPF

The National Planning Policy Framework sets out the Government's planning policies for England and how these are expected to be applied. At the heart is a presumption in favour of sustainable development. Development proposals that accord with the development plan should be approved unless material considerations indicate otherwise. Where the development plan is absent, silent, or relevant policies are out-of-date, permission should be granted unless any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the Framework as a whole; or where specific policies in the Framework indicate development should be restricted or unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

In respect of this application, relevant policies include:

Section 12: Achieving well-designed and beautiful places -

The creation of high quality, beautiful and sustainable buildings and places is fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve. Good design is a key aspect of sustainable

development, creates better places in which to live and work and helps make development acceptable to communities. Being clear about design expectations, and how these will be tested, is essential for achieving this. So too is effective engagement between applicants, communities, local planning authorities and other interests throughout the process.

Within section 12, paragraph 139 is the most relevant which indicates:-

Development that is not well designed should be refused, especially where it fails to reflect local design policies and government guidance on design, taking into account any local design guidance and supplementary planning documents such as design guides and codes. Conversely, significant weight should be given to:

- a) development which reflects local design policies and government guidance on design, taking into account any local design guidance and supplementary planning documents such as design guides and codes; and/or
- b) outstanding or innovative designs which promote high levels of sustainability, or help raise the standard of design more generally in an area, so long as they fit in with the overall form and layout of their surroundings.

Local Plan

In reference to this application, the following Local Plan policies are relevant:

GD1 - General Development – Development will be approved if there will be no significant adverse effect on the living conditions and residential amenity of existing and future residents.

SD1 - Presumption in favour of Sustainable Development: When considering development proposals we will take a positive approach that reflects the presumption in favour of sustainable development contained in the National Planning Policy Framework.

D1 - High Quality Design and Place Making: Development is expected to be of a high quality design and will be expected to respect, take advantage of and reinforce the distinctive, local character and other features of Barnsley.

T4 - New Development & Highway Safety: New development will be expected to be designed and built to provide all transport users within and surrounding the development with safe, secure and convenient access and movement.

Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD)

House Extensions and Other Domestic Extensions

Assessment

Principle of development

The site is located within land designated as Urban Fabric. Extensions to residential properties are considered acceptable where they do not have a detrimental impact on the amenity of surrounding residents, visual amenity and on highway safety.

Residential Amenity

Broomhead Road is a long, almost straight road but in some areas, small cul-de-sacs intersect the street, as in this instance which creates corner plots such as the application dwelling, with its rear garden backing onto the front gardens of dwellings to the rear. This unusual positioning of the dwelling within the broader street scene does raise some concerns about overshadowing and loss of outlook caused by the proposed two-story side extension, although the rear ground floor extension would have less impact. Whilst light levels should not be significantly affected, there would be a potential loss of outlook for some dwellings within the rear cul-de-sac caused by the height and width of the side extension. Because of the width of the extension, being very close to the highway (pavement), there may be a negative effect overshadowing on pedestrian access into the cul-de-sac with a sense of overbearing. Although currently there is an extension at No. 60, if the proposal at the application dwelling was allowed, a precedent would be set causing difficulty to refuse any similar extension being constructed at No. 60. If extensions were allowed at both dwellings, the combined impact would have a more severe impact than potential impact caused by the current proposal at the application dwelling. Together, similar extensions would create a tunnel effect leading into the estate, cause a greater detriment to pedestrians and have a substantial impact on overshadowing and loss of outlook within the cul-de-sac.

Regarding privacy, both the front and rear first floor elevation windows of the side extension would be of an acceptable distance to of over 21m to directly overlooked windows of neighboring dwellings, but the rear windows would closely overlook several front gardens of dwellings to the rear, in comparison to the greater distances between the front windows and gardens across the road. For the attached neighbour of No.46, there would be no impact from the side extension and minimal impact from the rear ground floor extension as the neighbouring dwelling have their own rear extension. In common, there would be minimal impact on the amenity of the adjacent corner plot at No.60.

In consideration of all impacts, whilst the proposal may have a moderate effect upon residential amenity, it has the potential to set a precedent, which could lead to a much more severe impact on residential amenity.

Visual Amenity

Unlike residential amenity, which overall would have a moderate effect on current residential amenity of neighbouring dwellings, the issue of visual amenity is more complex as the proposal does not meet local policy requirements in two key aspects, and would have an immediate and significant impact upon visual amenity. Firstly, the proposals clearly do not meet the guidance of the local SPD House Extensions and Other Domestic Extensions, as there is no step down from the roof or set back within the front elevation of the side extension.

In contrast to the proposed non-compliant nature of the first issue, the second issue regarding visual amenity has been deemed potentially harmful to both the character of the dwelling and more significantly its impact within the broader street scene. In paragraph 7.25, page 19 of the local SPD

'House Extensions and Other Domestic Extensions' explicitly states that 'The sideways projection of a two-storey side extension should not exceed more than two thirds the width of the original dwelling. Where located on a corner plot the sideways projection should not exceed more than half the width of the gap between the side elevation of the original dwellings and the side boundary (unless the gap exceeded more than two thirds the width of the original dwelling).' On this occasion, on full assessment of the proposal, it was found that the proposal would breach this SPD requirement, and subsequently cause significant harm to the visual amenity of the street scene. Unlike No. 27, the opposite dwelling, which has a two-storey side extension, the space between the side elevation and the boundary treatment of the application dwelling is of much shorter width than was originally available at No. 27 and could be comparable to the residual width between the extension and boundary of No.27. Once this issue was confirmed, an option to reduce the size of the proposal, particularly the width of the two-story side extension was offered, prior to making a refusal of the application, but ultimately this was deemed unacceptable, and a refusal of the application was requested.

Highway Safety

The proposed increase in parking provision at the front of the dwelling was deemed acceptable and would meet local policy requirements for parking provision. With no further proposed changes to access or parking arrangements, there was no concern over highway safety.

Recommendation: Refuse