

**Application Reference: 2025/0239****Site Address:** 20 Taylor Crescent, Grimethorpe, Barnsley, S72 7NU**Introduction:**

This application seeks full planning permission for a Single storey front porch extension and 2 storey rear extension to dwelling.

**Relevant Site Characteristics**

Located in an established residential area of Grimethorpe, the semi-detached house is in effect a corner plot, separated from the neighbouring dwelling on Coronation Avenue by an alleyway. No.29, the corner house of Coronation Avenue features a large side garden, which creates the traditional corner dwelling between the two streets. With Taylor Crescent located on a hill, No.29 and all other dwellings on Coronation Avenue are set at a lower level and are also set at a 90-degree angle to the application dwelling and other houses on Taylor Crescent. Most dwellings in the area are terraced or semi-detached houses constructed of red brick and are predominantly rendered above ground floor level. Most houses have enclosed, and reasonable sized front and rear gardens, The application dwelling's rear garden is considerably shorter than other rear gardens but does feature a wide front garden. The alleyway adjacent to the west elevation of the dwelling leads to an area of land allocated as allotments but appears not to be formally used for this purpose.

**Site History**

There is no site history recorded for this site.

**Detailed description of Proposed Works**

The proposal is for a rear extension featuring both a two-storey and single storey section. Additionally, a front porch style extension is also proposed on the front elevation. The two-storey rear extension is proposed to be constructed of brickwork and render to match the existing dwelling, along with a complementary style of tiled roof, to match the original dwelling. The lower ground floor aspect of the extension is to be constructed of matching brickwork and feature a pitched roof. The front extension would be constructed of matching brickwork and feature a dual pitched tiled roof. A window on the front elevation of the porch is proposed, along with an entrance door on the east side elevation. The first floor of the proposed extension would feature two windows, set slightly closer to the eastern elevation of the dwelling, and set approximately 2.7m forward of the original rear elevation. The ground floor extension would replicate the existing French style doors, again setting them closer to the eastern elevation, and along with a new window, would be set approximately 4m forward of the original rear elevation.

The eaves and ridge heights of the front extension would be approximately 2.4m and 3.7m respectively. The width and front projection would be approximately 3.5m and 2m respectively, with an approx. area of 7 sqm. The approximate eaves and ridge height of the two-storey section of the rear extension would be 4.8m and 6.98m, matching the existing roof, whilst for the single story would section feature an eaves and roof height of approx. 2.4m and 3.07m respectively.

The total rear projection of the extension would be 4m, but only 2.7m of this would be two-storey,

## **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.

Highways – No objection.

### **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 proposed front porch extension is significantly larger than one which may otherwise be allowed through permitted development and would be quite dominant within the street scene. However, whilst such a large front extension would not usually be allowed on the front elevation of such a dwelling, on this occasion and principally due to the numerous and varied style and size of front extensions within the street scene and broader area, which have been either historically approved or constructed without due consent; it would be unjustified to refuse consent for this aspect of the application. Therefore, and only in this specific instance, the proposed front porch extension would be considered to have a limited impact on the scale, design and character of the dwelling and broader street scene.

In similarity to the front extension, the rear extension is quite large and given the dwelling's heightened position, and corner location, would be quite dominant within the wider street scene. In contrast to the extensions dominance within the wider street scene, it does remain reasonably proportionate in scale to the original dwelling and broadly meets current policy as outlined in the House Extensions and Other Domestic Extensions SPD.

Support in meeting SPD requirements arises from the limited projection of the two-storey aspect of the rear extension, at 2.7m, it is less than the maximum 3.5m which may have been acceptable, and with the additional single storey aspect extending the extension's total projection to 4m, this also meets the maximum guidance for a single storey extension to a semi-detached house. An eaves height of less than 2.5m for the single-story aspect of the extension, and a step in form the boundary on this aspect of the extension also aids in improving the overall scale and design of the proposal. In addition to the above, with required matching materials and a similar style roof for the two-story aspect, and a complementary style roof for the single storey aspect of the rear extension, visual amenity would be maintained to a reasonable degree, in accordance with Local Plan Policy D1 and the SPD, and the proposal would be considered as having a limited impact.

#### Impact on Neighbouring Amenity

The size and location of the front porch would only result in a potential minimum impact on the attached neighbouring dwelling. Therefore, it would be considered to have a limited effect on the amenity of the attached neighbouring dwelling, and little or no impact on the amenity of any other dwelling.

With an irregular shaped curtilage and the majority of available land being found in the front and side garden, but the latter narrowing towards the rear garden, aside from a modest sized front extension, any significant development would be limited to the rear garden, which in comparison to neighbouring gardens features a shorter distance to the rear boundary. By including a two-section rear extension, the proposal provides desired space for the applicant, without significantly impacting the amenity of the attached neighbouring dwelling, however there would be some potential impact.

The proposal is constructed almost up to the boundary line with the attached neighbouring dwelling, which is allowed, although if the proposal was constructed through permitted development, a maximum eaves height of 3m, when located within 2m of a boundary treatment

would apply. As this is a planning application, part of the assessment uses the 45-degree rule. On this occasion, whilst the two-story aspect of the proposal does meet the 45-degree rule, the ground floor aspect of the extension slightly breaches it. In mitigation of this slight breach, the extension overall appears to have been considerably designed to minimise the impact on neighbouring amenity, and a request to in effect cut the corner off the extension to comply with policy would seem unjust when the resulting reduction would have a relatively insignificant improvement on amenity for the occupant's of the neighbouring dwelling who did not object to the proposal. In overall consideration of the extension, the negative impact on the amenity of the attached neighbouring dwelling would be considered as modest.

The proposed rear extension may have a slight impact on the neighbouring dwellings on Coronation Avenue, but with no side windows, and a minimum distance of approx. 10m, there would be no impact on privacy but possibly some potential impact of overbearing given the existing level difference between the streets. As such, the impact on neighbouring amenity would be assessed as modest.

The proposed rear extension does not fully comply with guidance in the House Extensions and Other Domestic Extensions SPD, which indicates that first-floor windows should be located at least 10m from the rear boundary, and that two storey extension should not exceed a projection of 3.5m. Mitigation for this proposal arises that the rear boundary borders an area allocated as allotments but does not appear to be used for such a purpose. The residential dwellings beyond are more than the 21m distance required between windows. Whilst the whole extension has a 4m projection, the two-storey aspect is limited to 2.7m. These SPD requirements appear to be aimed at protecting residential amenity, but with no residential addresses immediately behind, the application dwelling, the impingement in relation to SPD guidance would have little or no effect on residential amenity.

### Highways

Highways have noted that whilst the size of the house would increase, the number of bedrooms does not. Combined with the fact that whilst the dwelling is already underprovided for parking provision, no parking provision is lost; Highways have stated that they are unable to object to the proposal but would recommend an increase in parking provision. As the required parking provision is only desirable, it would not be possible to reject the application on this point, especially as the impact on Highway Safety would be unlikely to be affected and would be considered as having a limited effect.

### 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 has not been necessary to make contact with the applicant to request amendments to the proposal during the consideration of the application, as it was deemed acceptable.

**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.**