Application Reference: 2026/0528.

Location: 102 Doncaster Road, Goldthorpe, Rotherham, S63 9HU.

Introduction

This application seeks planning permission for the installation of a first-floor balcony to the rear of the dwellinghouse.

Relevant Site Characteristics

This application relates to a modest-sized narrow plot located within the Goldthorpe (Dearne Towns) settlement on the south side of Doncaster Road and in an area that is principally residential characterised by two-storey semi-detached and terraced dwellinghouses of similar scale and varying appearance. The topography of the area is somewhat level. Goldthorpe Primary School is located to the north-west, allotments are located to the south, and Goldthorpe Recreation Ground is located to the east.

The application dwellinghouse is a two-storey semi-detached dwellinghouse constructed of brick with a stone frontage and a grey slate tiled pitched roof. The application dwellinghouse is fronted by a small enclosed area of paving enclosed by low-built stone walls. Access to the rear is from a pedestrian access to the side which leads onto a raised area of concrete that steps down onto to other areas of paving forming the available rear curtilage. The application dwellinghouse benefits from an existing two-storey gable projection and there are existing significant outbuildings to the south within the plot, including one approved under application 2022/0600. The development site is bounded by existing high level boundary fences and walls.



Site History

2022/0600	Detached storage building in rear garden.	Approved.

Detailed Description of Proposed Works

This application seeks planning permission for the installation of a first-floor balcony to the rear of the dwellinghouse.

The proposed balcony would measure approximately 2.2 metres (W) x 2.5 metres (D) x 3.6 metres (H) excluding balustrades.

The proposed balcony would incorporate 1.8-metre-high glazed privacy screen balustrades to both sides (east and west) and a 1.2-metre-high balustrade to the rear (south).

The proposed balcony would be constructed of a black powder-coated steel frame with a grey composite decking.

During the application process, the rearward projection of the proposed balcony was reduced from three metres to 2.5 metres.



Relevant Policies

The Development Plan

Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires development 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 was adopted in January 2019 and is 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 a full Council meeting held 24th November 2022. The review determined that the Local Plan remains fit for purpose and is adequately delivering on 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, which is due to take place in 2027, or earlier, if circumstances require it.

Development plan policies (or parts of those policies) which are materially inconsistent with national decision-making policies in the NPPF should be given very limited weight. The only exception to this is where they have been examined and adopted or made against the NPPF (August 2026). Other development plan policies should not be given reduced weight simply because they were adopted prior to the publication of the NPPF (August 2026).

The development site is located within the Urban Barnsley settlement and is allocated as Urban Fabric in the adopted Local Plan which is land within the settlement with no specific allocation.

The following Local Plan policies are therefore relevant in this case:

- *Policy SD1: Presumption in favour of Sustainable Development.*
- *Policy GD1: General Development.*
- *Policy POLL1: Pollution Control and Protection.*
- *Policy D1: High Quality Design and Place Making.*
- *Policy T4: New Development and Transport Safety.*

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 following SPDs are relevant in this case:

- *House extensions and other domestic alterations (Adopted March 2024).*
- *Parking (Adopted November 2019).*

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

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

Planning law requires that applications for planning permission be determined in accordance with the development plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF, 2026) sets out the overarching planning framework for England. It has replaced the previous version published in December 2024 and introduced a revised structure comprising national decision-making policies organised by policy code rather than paragraph number in the main body of the NPPF. Paragraph 1 confirms that the NPPF is a material consideration of critical importance for making decisions on development proposals in England.

Paragraph 15 confirms that the purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development, and NPPF Policy S3 sets out a presumption in favour of sustainable development, with paragraph 17 setting out the three overarching objectives of sustainable development: economic, social and environmental. Relevant policies have been taken into account throughout the assessment of this application according to the issues raised by the proposal.

The following NPPF sections and NPPF policies are relevant in this case:

Section 3: Decision-making policies

- *DM3: Determining development proposals.*
- *DM6: Use of planning conditions and obligations.*
- *DM7: Relationship with other regulatory regimes.*

Section 4: Achieving Sustainable development

- *S3: Presumption in favour of sustainable development.*
- *S4: Principle of development within settlements.*

Section 14: Achieving well-designed places

- *DP3: Key principles for well-designed places.*

Section 15: Promoting sustainable transport

- *TR3: Locating development in sustainable locations.*
- *TR4: Street design, access and parking.*
- *TR6: Assessing transport impacts.*

Section 17: Pollution, public protection and security

- *P3: Living conditions and pollution.*

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 this guidance into account when taking decisions.

Other Material Considerations

- *South Yorkshire Residential Design Guide (SYRDG) 2011.*

Representations

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

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

One objection was received and concerns regarding loss of privacy were raised.

Consultees

No statutory or non-statutory consultees were consulted on this application.

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 unless the NPPF establishes a specific weight:

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

Principle of Development

NPPF Policy S3(1): Presumption in favour of sustainable development establishes that decisions on development proposals should apply a presumption in favour of sustainable development. This means that NPPF Policy S4 should be applied when considering development proposals within settlements; and in all locations, development proposals that accord with both an up-to-date development plan and the decision-making policies in the NPPF should be approved without delay.

In this instance, the development site is located within the Goldthorpe (Dearne Towns) settlement and therefore, NPPF Policy S4 is applicable.

NPPF Policy S4(1): Principle of development within settlements establishes: Development proposals within settlements should be approved unless the benefits of doing so would be substantially outweighed by any adverse effects, when assessed against the national decision-making policies in this Framework (NPPF).

Extensions and alterations to a dwelling are acceptable in principle if the development would remain subservient and would be of a scale and design which would be appropriate to the host property and would not be detrimental to the amenity afforded to adjacent properties, including visual amenity and highway safety.

Considering the above, this proposal is considered acceptable in principle subject to an assessment of the following matters.

Impact on Neighbouring Amenity

NPPF Policy P3(1): Living conditions and pollution establishes: Development proposals should be appropriate for their location, taking into account the likely effects (including cumulative effects) of pollution on health, living conditions and the natural environment, whether these effects are on or off-site; and whether this is as a result of the development itself or the product of preexisting conditions in its vicinity. Within this context development proposals should accord with NPPF Policy P3(2) (a-f) where applicable.

Local Plan Policy GD1: General Development, indicates that support will be given to development if there will be no significant adverse impact on the living conditions and residential amenity of existing and future residents, and the development would be compatible with neighbouring land and will not significantly prejudice the current or future use of the neighbouring land.

Local Plan Policy POLL1: Pollution Control and Protection, establishes that support will be given to development if it is demonstrated that proposals would not be likely to result, directly or indirectly, in an increase in air, surface water and groundwater, noise, smell, dust, vibration, light or other pollution which would unacceptably affect or cause nuisance to the natural and built environment or to people.

The adopted House extensions and other domestic alterations SPD provides specific guidance for decking and raised platforms. It establishes that decking and raised platforms can often give rise to increased overlooking of neighbouring dwellinghouses, and particularly their gardens. Such development will only therefore be allowed where the privacy of neighbouring residents is not detrimentally affected by significantly increased overlooking. In addition, decking and raised platforms should not have a significantly detrimental impact on visual amenity and for this reason decking will not be allowed where it is prominently located and can be easily viewed from public vantage points. In some circumstances, to reduce overlooking, it may be possible to include screening such as fencing with an application for decking or a raised platform but any screening should not result in significant overshadowing or loss of outlook from neighbouring dwellings or have a detrimental impact on visual amenity or the character of the dwelling.

During the application process, concerns regarding potential loss of privacy were raised. The Local Planning Authority (LPA) also suggested reducing the rearward projection of the proposed balcony from 3 metres to 1.5 metres to address concerns regarding the excessive scale of the proposal in relation to the type of development proposed, potential overdevelopment of the plot, and potential increased noise and disturbance impacts.

However, the Applicant argued that there had never been a history of noise complaints associated with the application address and requested that any concern regarding noise be based upon the likely and reasonably foreseeable use of this particular balcony rather than a general assumption that the use of any balcony would create an unacceptable noise impact. It was stated that the balcony is intended as additional private external space associated with the existing dwellinghouse and that there is no proposed commercial use, entertainment use or other activity that would inherently generate significant noise.

The Applicant also argued that the suggested reduction would substantially change the purpose and usability of the balcony significantly diminishing its benefit and functionality. As such, the Applicant was reluctant to agree to the level of reduction suggested.

Extensive correspondence between the Applicant and the LPA continued to find a reasonable compromise to address identified issues. A potential reduction to the rearward

projection from three metres to two metres was suggested, but the Applicant again declined this and instead submitted a reduction to 2.5 metres. This application is being considered on this basis.

The proposed first-floor balcony would be erected off a rear projection to the application dwellinghouse which forms a pair of semi-detached dwellinghouses with adjoining 100 Doncaster Road. The adjoining dwellinghouse is located to the west. It is understood that the proposed balcony would be accessed from a bathroom within the application dwellinghouse.

Regarding potential noise and disturbance impacts, the scale of this proposal in respect of its rearward projection and the floorspace created are considered to be excessive for this type of development to the rear of a semi-detached dwellinghouse. Despite the Applicant stating that there had never been a history of noise complaints associated with the application address and requesting that the LPA only consider the anticipated use from the current occupant(s), the LPA must consider the potential impacts from and on existing and potential future residents given that planning permission is tied to land and to any individual(s) and in accordance with Local Plan Policy GD1. In this instance, the excessive scale and use of the balcony is considered to lend itself to increased levels of activity and associated noise, which, given the balcony's elevated position, would be more readily experienced by adjoining and adjacent neighbouring properties than if the noise were generated at ground level from the garden. Consequently, it is considered that this proposal would erode the living conditions of neighbouring residents. Therefore, on balance, this proposal is considered unacceptable in this regard and contrary to adopted design guidance, Local Plan Policies GD1 and POLL1 and NPPF Policy P3 with significant weight attributed against.

Regarding potential overshadowing and loss of light impacts, the proposed balcony would be erected to the east of and immediately adjacent the western shared boundary with 100 Doncaster Road. In this instance, this proposal would exceed the 45-degree rule – which is applied to assess and limit the extension of any potential overshadowing and overbearing impact – by approximately 1.5 metres, contrary to adopted design guidance. Whilst this weighs against this proposal, it is also acknowledged that the positioning of the proposed development in relation to the sun path, existing high boundary treatments, the stilted structure of the proposed development, and the transparency of the balustrade glazing are all relevant factors that could lessen the extent of potential overshadowing and loss of light. Any potential overshadowing impacts are anticipated to be limited to the early morning, and the structure and balustrade glazing could allow for a small amount of natural light to continue to pass through. However, given the overall scale (rearward projection and height) and proximity of the balcony to existing high level boundary treatments and neighbouring habitable room windows, it is considered that the cumulative effects of this proposal and pre-existing on-site conditions could be perceived as having an overbearing impact comprising overshadowing and reduced outlook impacts and an oppressive sense of enclosure for neighbouring existing and future residents. Therefore, on balance, this proposal is considered unacceptable in this regard and contrary to adopted design guidance, Local Plan Policy GD1 and NPPF Policy P3 with significant weight attributed against.

Regarding potential overlooking and loss of privacy impacts, the proposed balcony would be erected approximately 2.5 metres from the eastern shared boundary with 104 Doncaster Road and immediately adjacent the western shared boundary with 100 Doncaster Road and would incorporate 1.8-metre-high obscure glazed privacy screening balustrades to both sides with a 1.2-metre-high glazed balustrade to the rear. The lower balustrade to the rear would provide views into the development site and onto the adjacent allotments beyond with no direct views of habitable room windows. Views of neighbouring curtilages are anticipated to be limited and would unlikely be significantly greater than the views possible from the existing windows. In this instance, the distance from the eastern shared boundary and the

provision of 1.8-metre-high obscure glazed privacy screening balustrades to both sides is anticipated to act as sufficient mitigation lessening the extent of any potential impacts that could otherwise be detrimental to the amenity afforded to adjoining and adjacent residents. This proposal is therefore, on balance, considered acceptable in this regard with significant weight attributed in favour. However, this does not outweigh other material considerations in respect of potential noise and disturbance and overbearing impact.

Considering the above, on balance, the impacts on neighbouring amenities is considered to weigh significantly against this proposal and its approval.

This proposal is therefore considered contrary to NPPF Policy P3: Living conditions and pollution and Local Plan Policies GD1: General Development and POLL1: Pollution Control and Protection and is considered unacceptable regarding its potential impact on neighbouring amenity.

Scale, Design and Impact on Character

NPPF Policy DP3(1): Key principles for well-designed places establishes development proposals should respond to their context so that they integrate with and enhance their surroundings. This should not preclude innovation or change where appropriate.

NPPF Policy DP3(3): Key principles for well-designed places establishes that development proposals should be refused if, without clear justification, they conflict with paragraph 1 of this policy or relevant aspects of the principles in paragraph 2, or with any explicit design standards set out in the development plan (including those in locally specific policies, guides, codes or masterplans). Substantial weight should be given to compliance with relevant development plan policies when assessing the design quality of proposals.

Local Plan Policy D1: High Quality Design and Placemaking, establishes support would be given to development if proposals would achieve a high quality of design and would respect, take advantage of, and reinforce the distinctive local character and features of Barnsley.

The adopted House extensions and other domestic alterations SPD provides specific guidance for decking and raised platforms. It establishes that decking and raised platforms should not have a significantly detrimental impact on visual amenity and for this reason decking will not be allowed where it is prominently located and can be easily viewed from public vantage points. Any associated screening should also not have a detrimental impact on visual amenity or the character of the dwellinghouse.

In this instance, the proposed balcony would be erected to the rear of the application dwellinghouse and would not be an overtly prominent or dominant feature within the street scene of Doncaster Road, therefore, having no impact on its character. Limited views may be possible from Kingsmark Way at the junction with Doncaster Road to the east and Garden Street to the west. Views would also be possible from the adjacent allotments to the south. However, when considered within the context of various extensions to neighbouring properties and various buildings and structures within the allotments, it is not considered that this proposal would have a considerable adverse impact on visual amenity, specifically in respect of materiality.

Notwithstanding the above, whilst it is acknowledged that some surrounding properties benefit from extensions or other similar projecting structures, these are limited to ground level, and the scale of this proposal in respect of its rearward projection and the floorspace created are considered to be excessive for this type of development to the rear of a semi-detached dwellinghouse, in comparison. Introducing such scale at first-floor level would contribute to an incongruous visual dominance not observed elsewhere. In isolation, this is

considered to have a moderate harmful impact on the character of the application dwellinghouse. However, when considering cumulative impacts of the existing and proposed development within the development site, it is considered that this proposal would further diminish the character of the application dwellinghouse through overdevelopment of the plot, thereby resulting in a significant harmful impact on the character of the application dwellinghouse.

The LPA has considered the arguments made by the Applicant such as their belief that the reduction to a 2.5-metre rearward projection represents a meaningful reduction in scale, and that the balcony would not constitute overdevelopment because it is not ground level development removing a substantial area of the garden. However, the LPA respectfully disagrees with these points for the reasons set out. It is considered that clear justification has not been provided to change the LPA's position. Any potential benefits of this proposal are anticipated to be entirely private and would not outweigh the anticipated potential harms.

Considering the above, on balance, this is considered to weigh significantly against this proposal and its approval. This proposal should therefore be refused in accordance with NPPF Policy DP3(3).

This proposal is therefore considered contrary to NPPF Policy DP3: Key principles for well-designed places and Local Plan Policy D1: High Quality Design and Placemaking and is considered unacceptable regarding its potential impact on scale, design, character and visual amenity.

Impact on Highways

NPPF Policy TR3: Locating development in sustainable locations supports development that is located where it can support sustainable patterns of movement, enable good accessibility for different users and make the most of existing and proposed transport infrastructure.

NPPF Policy TR4: Street design, access and parking establishes that to contribute to creating well-designed places, transport considerations should be integral to the design of development, proposals for which should: give priority first to walking, wheeling and cycle movements, both within the scheme and with neighbouring areas; and second – so far as possible – to facilitating easy access to high quality public transport, with layouts and densities which maximise the catchments for bus or other public transport services. Proposals should also provide a suitable number of parking spaces for a range of transport modes where appropriate, reflecting the location and nature of the development (including its connectivity), any locally-set standards in the development plan.

NPPF Policy TR6(4): Assessing transport impacts establishes that development proposals should be refused if they would have a severe adverse impact on the transport network (in terms of capacity and congestion, including cumulative impacts), or an unacceptable impact on highway safety; taking into account any mitigation measures proposed as well as any wider network improvements, including measures to support sustainable patterns of movement. This applies both during the construction phase and following completion.

This proposal is not considered to be prejudicial to highway safety because existing off-street parking and access arrangements within the development site would not be affected and the proposal would not result in a requirement to provide additional spaces. As such, there is no clear justification to otherwise warrant the refusal of this application against NPPF Policy TR6.

Considering the above, this is considered to weigh modestly in favour of this proposal and its approval.

This proposal is therefore considered to comply with NPPF Policies TR3: Location development in sustainable locations and TR4: Street design, access and parking, and Local Plan Policies T3: New Development and Sustainable Travel and T4: New Development and Transport Safety and is considered acceptable regarding its potential impact on highway safety. Nevertheless, a proposal that is considered acceptable regarding its potential impact on highway safety does not justify the approval of a scheme that is considered unacceptable regarding its potential impacts on neighbouring and visual amenity.

Planning Balance and Conclusion

In accordance with the provisions of NPPF Policy S3 and Local Plan Policy SD1 this proposal is considered within the context of the presumption in favour of sustainable development.

The anticipated benefits of approving this development would not be substantially outweighed by any adverse effects, when assessed against the national decision-making policies, to otherwise justify a refusal on principal in accordance with NPPF Policy S4.

Nevertheless, on balance, this proposal is considered unacceptable regarding its impact on neighbouring amenity in respect of potential noise and disturbance and overbearing impacts, contrary to adopted design guidance, Local Plan Policies GD1 and POLL1 and NPPF Policy P3. Significant weight is attributed to such potential impacts against this proposal and its approval.

This proposal, on balance, is also considered unacceptable regarding its impact on visual amenity in respect of introducing an incongruous visual dominance not observed elsewhere and other cumulative harms such as overdevelopment of the plot, contrary adopted design guidance, Local Plan Policy D1 and NPPF Policy DP3. Significant weight is attributed to such potential impacts against this proposal and its approval.

This proposal is considered acceptable regarding its potential impacts on highway safety in accordance with Local Plan Policies T3 and T4 and NPPF Policies TR3 and TR4.

For the reasons given above, and taking all other matters into consideration, this proposal is not considered to conform with all relevant national and local planning policies and supplementary guidance.

Planning permission should therefore be refused.

RECOMMENDATION: Refuse.

Justification

Statement of compliance with Article 35 of the Town and Country Development Management Procedure Order 2015.

In dealing with the application referred to above, despite the Local Planning Authority wanting to work with the applicant in a positive and proactive manner based on seeking solutions to problems arising in relation to dealing with this planning application, in this instance this has not been possible due to the reasons mentioned above.

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 representations, 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.

Reason(s) for refusal:

1. In the opinion of the local planning authority, the excessive scale and use of the proposed balcony by existing and potential future occupant(s) of the application dwellinghouse is considered to lend itself to increased levels of activity and associated noise, which, given the balcony's elevated position, would be more readily experienced by adjoining and adjacent neighbouring properties than if the noise were generated at ground level from the garden. Consequently, it is considered that this proposal would erode the living conditions of existing and potential future residents, contrary to adopted design guidance, Local Plan Policies GD1: General Development and POLL1: Pollution Control and Protection and NPPF Policy P3: Living conditions and pollution.

2. In the opinion of the local planning authority, the excessive scale of the proposed balcony and its proximity to existing high level boundary treatments and neighbouring habitable room windows together with pre-existing on-site conditions could result in cumulative harms and an overbearing impact comprising overshadowing and reduced outlook impacts and an oppressive sense of enclosure, eroding the living conditions of existing and potential future residents, contrary to adopted design guidance, Local Plan Policies GD1: General Development and NPPF Policy P3: Living conditions and pollution.

3. In the opinion of the local planning authority, the excessive scale of the proposed balcony introduced at first-floor level would contribute to an incongruous visual dominance not observed elsewhere. This proposal would also contribute to harmful cumulative impacts comprising existing and proposed development within the development site, that would further diminish the character of the application dwellinghouse through overdevelopment of the plot, thereby resulting in a significant harmful impact on the character of the application dwellinghouse, contrary to Local Plan Policy D1: High Quality Design and Place Making and NPPF Policy DP3: Key principles for well-designed places.