

Application Reference: 2026/0102

Site Address: 11 Hardwick Grove, Dodworth, Barnsley, S75 3SS

Introduction: Erection of front and side boundary wall 1m to 1.5m in height (Retrospective).

Relevant Site Characteristics

The property is a detached bungalow within the Dodworth area. The surrounding area and street scene is characterised by similarly detached bungalows constructed from similar materials to the site. The boundary treatment within the street scene is characterised by low levels walls or open plan with no boundary treatment. Bushes and hedges are also used as boundary treatment in the street scene.

The site is considered a corner plot and is in a prominent location on both Hardwick Grove and Strafford Walk. The site provides garden space to the west, south and east of the dwelling. The garden space is acknowledged to be on a higher level than the highway sloping approximately 0.5 metres in height down to the south of the site.

The site provides a driveway to the north of the dwelling allowing vehicle access to a garage. A side extension has been erected to the south of the dwelling and a 1 metre to 1.5-metre-high boundary wall has been partly erected to the west and south boundary of the site. The wall is the development being retrospectively applied for on this application.

Planning History

Planning Reference	Description	Decision
2024/0426	Erection of single storey front and side extension to dwelling and erection of replacement and enlarged detached garage (Amended Description).	Approve with Conditions

Detailed description of Proposed Works

The applicant is seeking retrospective permission to erect a 1 metre to 1.5 metre high wall to the west and south boundary. The wall starts at approximately 1 metre in height to the west of the site. The top of the wall maintains its level moving to the south boundary. Due to the topography of the site, falling approximately 0.5 metres., the wall reaches approximately 1.5 metres in height on the south boundary. Upon site inspection dated the 19th of February 2026, the south elevation of the wall was partially complete. The wall is constructed from brickwork matching the existing dwelling and extension.

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:

- Walls and Fences

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

Other guidance

The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 Part 2, Class A

Representations

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.

A total of 8 representations have been received making the following objections. The scale, design and character has been raised as an issue with neighbours describing the wall as unsightly, dominant and at a scale which is out of character with the estate. Neighbours have also raised the possibility of highway visibility being an issue when entering or exiting Hardwick Grove.

Although not a material planning consideration, a covenant has been raised outlining a restriction on boundary treatment for the estate.

Consultations

Highways – Highlighted an inconsistency between plans and deferred for further information with view to assessing visibility splays.

Planning Enforcement – No specific objection has been made, however a background to the enforcement action which has taken place at the site has been outlined. Additionally, it has been noted the wall is out of character with the street scene.

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 where 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 Supplementary Planning Document for Walls and Fences states 'The design, the materials used and the height of the wall or fence should relate to the character of the area in which you live or work. Particular care should be taken on site frontages, in other visually prominent locations, or in sensitive settings (close to listed buildings for example). In urban and suburban areas the use of stone, artificial stone and brick walls, good quality timber fencing, iron railings or hedges will usually be appropriate depending on the type and colour of the materials used and the character of the area and the individual property. The use of less appropriate materials such as blockwork, concrete panels, perforated blocks and industrial security fencing will often damage the appearance of a property and the area in which it is located. In rural areas, dry stone or traditional stone coursed walls or hedges (for instance, hawthorn) will usually be most appropriate.'

It is acknowledged the initial west elevation of the boundary wall leading from the driveway measures approximately 1 metre in height and is therefore considered permitted development. This element of the wall is therefore considered acceptable. The wall quickly exceeds 1 metre in height as the topography of the site and the highway falls towards the south of the site leading onto Trafford Walk. The height of the wall reaches approximately 1.5 metres in height on the south boundary of the site.

The 1.5 metre height of the wall is not considered to relate to the character of the area and street scene. The street scene is characterised by either no walls or low level walls with some railing features which are acknowledged to exceed the height of 1 metre, however given they are a railings, offer little dominance in the street scene. Tall bushes and hedges are acknowledged to be within the street scene, however cannot be considered as they do not constitute the built environment or development. It is therefore apparent that the

predominant character of the street scene is low level non dominant boundary treatment or no boundary treatment. The proposed 1.5 metre boundary wall is therefore contrary to the character of the street scene.

The proposed wall is located in a prominent location within the street scene of Hardwick Grove and particularly prominent on Strafford Walk. The height of the wall in a prominent location therefore plays a significant role within the street scene and the excessive height is considered considerably dominant, detracting from the character of the area.

It is acknowledged there is a significant boundary wall to the north of 98 High Street, Dodworth, however this wall is not considered to be in a prominent position on Strafford Walk, plays a small role in the boundary treatment of the site and does not directly face the principal elevation of neighbouring properties. Additionally, one poor precedent which is considered to be a significant distance away from the application site, does not warrant the approval of other boundary treatment which is contrary to local policy.

The use of matching materials is acknowledged, however the use of matching materials does not mitigate against the dominance of the wall and the separation from the existing low level boundary treatment character of the street scene.

It is therefore considered that the proposed boundary wall is not acceptable in terms of visual amenity and does not conform Local Plan Policy D1: High Quality Design and Place Making and the adopted Walls and Fences SPD due to its excessive height and as such carries substantial weight in opposition of the application.

Impact on Neighbouring Amenity

The proposed wall would not directly adjoin any neighbouring boundary other than where the edge of the wall would meet 22 Strafford Walk to the east of the site. The boundary wall would not therefore have any impact in terms of loss of light or loss of outlook. The wall is considered to be overly dominant from a design perspective compared to the street scene, however the proposed wall is not considered to dominate over the residential amenity of neighbouring properties.

It is therefore considered that the proposal would not result in a significant increase in overlooking, overshadowing or reduce levels of outlook to a detrimental level and is in compliance with Local Plan Policy GD1 General Development. This carries limited weight in favour of the application.

Highways

Although Highways have been consulted on the proposal, they have been unable to provide an informed consultation response due to inconsistencies between the submitted 'Block Plan and Wall Elevation', 'Site Location Plan' and the 'Location Plan with Siting of Proposed Wall'. The three separate plans detail the wall to finish in different locations adjacent to the driveway. Additionally, given it has been communicated to the applicant the current proposal would not be acceptable, the applicant has opted not to provide pedestrian visibility splays.

As a result of the lack of information and inconsistencies of the plans provided, highways have not provided a conclusive consultee response and it cannot be ensured the proposed wall would be safe to pedestrians and manoeuvring vehicles.

As such it cannot be guaranteed that the proposal is considered acceptable in terms of its impact on highway safety and in compliance with Local Plan Policy T4 New Development and Transport Safety. This therefore carries significant weight against the application.

Other Matters

It has been communicated through representations, that a covenant is in place on the estate restricting the erection of fences, walls or hedges, aiming to retain an open plan feel to the area. Although this is a legal consideration and therefore has no bearing on the decision making behind this application, this should be noted by the applicant should any legal matters arise.

The applicant included the proposed wall on the previous application for the extension to the dwelling 2024/0426 but the wall was found to be unacceptable during the application process and the plans including the wall were omitted from that application. Permission was therefore only granted for the extension and garage.

Despite this, the wall has now been partially erected, without planning permission, and the previously omitted plan has now been submitted by the same applicant for the current partly retrospective application.

As the applicant has moved ahead with erecting the wall despite the reservations communicated to the applicant prior to the earlier approval for the extension, it would therefore be reasonable to assume the applicant was aware the wall has been erected without planning permission and would not be considered acceptable.

Planning Balance and Conclusion

The proposal would provide a satisfactory impact on residential amenity however this would only hold limited weight balance in favour of the application. Highway safety has not been fully assessed due to inconsistencies between the plans and an omission of visibility splays and as a result carries significant weight against the application.

The proposed wall is excessive in height and scale and significantly exceeds what is permitted within local planning policy GD1 and adopted guidance and weighs substantially against the proposal.

For the reasons given above, and taking all other matters into consideration, the proposal does not fully comply with the relevant plan policies and planning permission should not be granted. For the reasons given above, and taking all other matters into consideration, planning permission should be refused.

RECOMMENDATION: Refuse

Justification

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

It has been necessary to make contact with the applicant to request plans and elevations which provide a scheme in line with the Walls and Fences SPD with a maximum wall height measured externally to the road of 1 metre. The applicant has outlined they are not willing to reduce the height of the wall. Plans were also requested which are consistent in order to allow highways to assess the proposal. Given it was communicated the proposal was not currently acceptable, further plans were not provided.

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.

The reason for the Council's decision to refuse planning permission are:

- 1) In the opinion of the local planning authority, the wall is situated in a prominent location and is considered to be of a height, scale and dominance which is out of character with the area and street scene and contrary to the Walls and Fences SPD. Consequently, this application is considered to be contrary to Local Plan Policies GD1: General Development and D1: High Quality Design and Place Making.
- 2) Insufficient information and clarification has been provided in order to determine if the proposal is acceptable in terms of its impact on highway safety and in compliance with Local Plan Policy T4 New Development and Transport Safety.