
2024/0360

Mr Vinny Moore

46 Folly Way, Monk Bretton, Barnsley, S71 2SP

Removal of existing detached garage and erection of two storey side extension.

Site Description

The application relates to a corner plot located on the east side of Folly Way, on the north side of Beacon View, and in an area that is principally residential characterised by a mix of dwelling types of similar scale and varying appearance.

The property in question forms part of a modern estate and is a detached two-storey red brick constructed dwellinghouse with a pitched roof and street-facing gable with grey coloured roof tiles. The property is fronted by an area of paving that extends along its north side to serve an existing detached garage to the rear. To the rear of the property is a modest sized garden bounded by fencing and a brick wall. The property is served by an existing dropped kerb.



Planning History

There is one previous application associated with this site:

1. 2015/0646 – Demolition of existing dwelling at 30 Cross Street and erection of 95 no. dwellings. – Approved.

Proposed Development

The applicant is seeking permission for the removal of an existing detached garage and the erection of a two-storey extension to the side of the application property.

The proposed extension would project from the north-west side elevation of the application property by approximately 3 metres and would have a depth of approximately 8.8 metres. The extension would adopt a pitched roof with an approximate eaves and ridge height of 5.4 metres and 7.8 metres respectively. The extension would be constructed of materials that would closely match those used in the external construction of the existing building.



Policy Context

Planning decisions should be made in accordance with the current development plan policies unless material considerations indicate otherwise; the National Planning Policy Framework (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 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 which are a material consideration in the decision-making process.

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.

Local Plan Allocation – Housing Allocation HS21.

The site is allocated as housing allocation HS21 within the adopted Local Plan. Allocation HS21 states that development will be expected to:

- Respect the historic setting of the adjacent listed building associated with Manor Farm immediately to the east by use of appropriate site layout, sympathetic design that reflects the setting, appropriate scaling, massing, details and materials; and
- Ensure that no development takes place around the access road to the cricket ground in order to protect the setting of Monk Bretton Cross Scheduled Ancient Monument.

However, the application site is significantly distanced from local designated heritage assets to the east. As such, the proposal is unlikely to impact their setting and therefore, the following policies are relevant:

- ***Policy SD1: Presumption in favour of Sustainable Development.***
- ***Policy GD1: General Development.***
- ***Policy D1: High quality design and place making.***
- ***Policy T4: New Development and Transport Safety.***

Supplementary Planning Document(s)

- ***House Extensions and Other Domestic Alterations.***
- ***Parking.***

National Planning Policy Framework

The NPPF sets out the Government's planning policies and how these are expected to be applied. The core of this is a presumption in favour of sustainable development. Proposals that align with the Local Plan should be approved unless material considerations indicate otherwise. In respect of this application, relevant policies include:

- ***Section 12: Achieving well-designed and beautiful places.***

Other Material Considerations

- ***South Yorkshire Residential Design Guide 2011.***

Consultations

No consultees were consulted on this application.

Representations

Neighbour notification letters were sent to surrounding properties and two representations were received from 2 no. addresses.

The following concerns which are material planning considerations were raised:

- Concerns regarding parking.
- Concerns regarding overlooking from rear-facing windows.
- Concerns regarding loss of privacy due to proximity of the extension.
- Concerns regarding the proximity of the extension to the side boundary.
- Concerns regarding the distance of the garage entrance from the highway.
- Concerns regarding a terracing affect which would be out of character for the area.

The following concerns which are not material planning considerations were raised:

- Concerns regarding encroachment.
- Concerns regarding earth disturbance.
- Concerns regarding lack of access to maintain the extension.

Whilst all concerns raised are acknowledged, only those which are material planning considerations can be taken into account.

Assessment

Principle of Development

Extensions and alterations to a domestic property are acceptable in principle provided that they remain subservient to the host property, are of a scale and design which is appropriate to the host property and are not detrimental to the amenity afforded to adjacent properties, including visual amenity and highway safety.

Residential Amenity

Proposals for extensions and alterations to a domestic property are considered acceptable provided that they would not adversely affect the amenity of neighbouring properties.

The proposed extension would be erected to the south-east of adjacent 48 Folly Way. Generally, extensions located to the south, south-east and south-west of neighbouring properties are likely to have a greater impact regarding overshadowing. As such, it is acknowledged that some overshadowing could occur. However, any potential impact would be limited to the blank side gable elevation of the neighbouring property and no habitable room windows would be impacted.

New first-floor windows would be limited to the front and rear elevations of the proposed extension. The House Extensions and Other Domestic Alterations SPD states that 12 metres should be maintained to a blank gable wall and 10 metres should normally be provided between rear-facing windows on the first floor (and above) and the rear boundary, and that windows to habitable rooms on an extended property should not be less than 21 metres from any other properties with habitable room windows. In this instance, a sufficient distance would be maintained to the rear north-east boundary and approximately 11.6 metres would be maintained to the blank gable elevation of 1 Beacon View. Whilst this would be less than the 12 metres stated in the House Extensions and Other Domestic Alterations SPD, the difference would be negligible. The distance maintained between the

front-facing first-floor habitable room window of the proposed extension and the habitable room windows of 27 Folly Way would be less than 21 metres, contrary to the House Extensions and Other Domestic Alterations SPD. However, the existing separation distance between the properties is less than 21 metres and the proposal would not lessen the existing distance and would therefore unlikely result in a significant loss of privacy.

During the application process, concerns were raised regarding overlooking and reduced privacy due to a rear-facing window and the proximity of the proposed extension to the north-east boundary and 48 Folly Way. The first-floor rear-facing window of the proposed extension would face into the application site and not directly towards the rear curtilage of the neighbouring property. Moreover, the extension would not project beyond the rear elevation of the application property and the new window would be aligned with existing first-floor windows. As such, any potential impact is unlikely to be significantly more impactful than any existing level of impact which could be experienced. Additionally, a single storey extension with the same footprint to that proposed could be erected as permitted development therefore not requiring planning permission and could draw similar concerns.

The proposed extension would follow the footprint of the existing dwellinghouse and would not obstruct any windows to the application and neighbouring properties. Moreover, no windows would be located on the north-west side elevation of the extension. As such, the proposal is unlikely contribute to reduced levels of outlook.

The proposal is therefore not considered to result in significantly increased levels of overshadowing, overlooking or reduced levels of outlook and is considered to comply with *Local Plan Policy GD1: General Development* and would be acceptable regarding residential amenity.

Visual Amenity

Proposals for extensions and alterations to a domestic property are considered acceptable provided that they do not significantly alter or detract from the character of the street scene and would sympathetically reflect the style and proportions of the existing dwelling.

The proposed extension would be visible from the public realm of Folly Way and would form a prominent feature within the street scene. The House Extensions and Other Domestic Alterations SPD states that the design of a side extension should reflect the design of the existing property in terms of roof style, pitch, materials and detailing, and should not have an excessive sideways projection of more than two thirds the width of the original property. Moreover, all two-storey side extensions should have a pitched roof following the form of the existing roof, and to prevent a terracing affect and to avoid detrimental changes to the character of the street scene, it will be desirable to provide a setback of at least 0.5 metres from the main front wall of the property. In addition, and where practicable, a side extension should also be set in by one metre from the side boundary with an adjacent property.

In this instance, the proposed extension would be constructed of materials that would closely match those used in the external construction of the existing building and would adopt a pitched roof that would follow the form of and be set below the ridge of the existing roof. The proposed extension would not adopt an excessive sideways projection of more than two thirds the width of the original property, and a set back from the main front wall of the application property of approximately 0.5 metres would be provided at first floor level, in accordance with the House Extensions and Other Domestic Alterations SPD. It is acknowledged that the proposed extension would not be set in by one metre from the north-west side boundary, contrary to the House Extensions and Other Domestic Alterations SPD. However, it is not considered practicable to provide this as it would significantly impact the practical usability of the extension. Moreover, as the extension would be set below the ridge of the existing roof of the application property and 48 Folly Way and set back from the main front wall of the application property at first floor level, it is considered that the proposal would appear subservient, and a detrimental terracing affect would be avoided.

The proposal is therefore not considered to significantly alter or detract from the character of the street scene or the existing building and is considered to comply with *Local Plan Policy D1: High Quality Design and Placemaking* and would be acceptable regarding visual amenity.

Highway Safety

The application site is served by existing paved areas to the front and north side of the application property and an existing single width detached garage to the rear.

The proposal would result in the loss of some existing off-street parking to the side of the application property and the loss of an existing detached garage to the rear. However, the proposed extension would incorporate an integral garage at ground level. The garage would not be sufficiently sized to be counted as a parking space as outlined in the South Yorkshire Residential Design Guide and the House Extensions and Other Domestic Alterations SPD. However, the internal space that would be created would be larger than the size of a standard off-street parking space (2.5 metres by 5 metres) and therefore it is accepted that the garage could be used for parking cars. Moreover, the proposal shows that the paving to the front of the application property could accommodate a minimum of two off-street parking spaces, in accordance with the parking SPD. If an existing dropped kerb needs to be extended or a new dropped kerb needs to be installed to facilitate off-street parking, the applicant will need to apply for a dropped kerb license. As such, a standard informative will be attached to any forthcoming decision.

During the application process, concerns were raised regarding parking and the proximity of the garage extension to the highway. It has been established that the application site could accommodate acceptable levels of off-street parking, in accordance with the House Extensions and Other Domestic Alterations SPD. In relation to the distance maintained between the garage door and the highway, the House Extensions and Other Domestic Alterations SPD does state that an extension or outbuilding which incorporates a garage door should have a minimum distance of 6 metres between a garage door and the highway. In this instance, approximately 4.2 metres would be maintained, contrary to the House Extensions and Other Domestic Alterations SPD. However, a single storey attached garage could be erected under permitted development therefore not requiring planning permission which would likely result in the same level of impact. As such, the proposal is not considered to be prejudicial to highway safety.

The proposal is therefore considered to comply with *Local Plan Policy T4: New Development and Transport Safety* and would be acceptable regarding highway safety.

**Recommendation -
Approve with Conditions**