

2022/0425

Mr Matt Bell

Erection of single storey side and two storey rear extensions.

45A Victoria Road, Barnsley, S70 2BU

Site Description

The application relates to a two-storey dwelling located within the Victoria Road Conservation Area. The property was previously a single dwelling but has been split into two units. The dwelling is of a stone construction with a hipped, slate tiled roof that which also includes a parapet. Access is taken from Victoria Road and off-street parking is provided within the site.

Victoria Road is the main thoroughfare through the conservation area and the buildings that front it show evident quality and a relatively high status of design / execution (materials etc.). The site is located within the Victoria Road and Huddersfield Road Conservation Area which is predominantly residential in nature; however, some of the larger buildings within the area have been converted from residential to office use.

Site History

2021/0108 - Erection of two storey side and single storey rear extension, retention and relocation of existing entrance – refused for the following reason;

In the opinion of the Local Planning Authority, the proposed extension would unbalance the symmetry of the original building when viewed from Victoria Road failing to preserve the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. In addition the application is insufficiently detailed regarding the impact of the proposed works on the surviving historic fabric of the existing property - 45a Victoria Road - and its impact on the wider Conservation Area. As such, the applicant has not demonstrated that the development would not cause harm to its special architectural and historic character. The proposal therefore fails to satisfy the requirements of Local Plan Policy HE1 and Paragraphs 190, 193 & 194 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

In the opinion of the Local Planning Authority, the group of TPO trees adjacent to site will be adversely affected by the proposed extension; due to an increased pressure to undertake continuous pruning works which would be considered excessive and inappropriate. The proposal is therefore contrary to Local Plan Policy BIO1 - Biodiversity and Geodiversity and Supplementary Planning Document - Trees and Hedgerows.





Proposed Development

The applicant is seeking permission to erect a wrap around single storey side extension and part 2 storey rear extension. The existing ornate entrance to the side of the dwelling would be removed and reused on the front of the proposed side extension. The side extension would be set back from the original front elevation and project 3.65m. The total length of the side/rear extension would be 8.87m and the full width 6.97m. The extensions would accommodate a new entrance lobby, shower room and open plan living/dining/kitchen area.

Existing elevations



Proposed Elevations



Existing plans



Proposed Plans



Policy Context

Local Plan Allocation – Conservation Area

Planning decisions should be made in accordance with the current development plan policies unless material considerations indicate otherwise and the recently revised NPPF does not change the statutory status of the development plan as the starting point for decision making.

Local Plan Policy GD1 – General Development – states that proposals for development will be approved where there will be no significant adverse effect on the living conditions and residential amenity of existing and future residents. Development will be expected to be compatible with neighbouring land and will not significantly prejudice the current or future use of neighbouring land. Policy GD1 below will be applied to all development.

Local Plan Policy D1 – High Quality Design and Place Making supersedes Core Strategy Policy CSP 29 and sets out the overarching design principles for the borough. Policy D1 States that development is expected to be of high-quality design and will be expected to respect, take advantage of and reinforce the distinctive, local character and features of Barnsley

Local Plan Policy BIO1 – Biodiversity and Geodiversity states that development will be expected to conserve and enhance the biodiversity and geological features of the borough

Local Plan Policy HE1 – The Historic Environment states that development which affects the historic environment and Barnsley's heritage assets, and their settings will be expected to protect or improve the character and/or appearance of Conservation Areas and Listed Buildings.

Local Plan Policy HE3 – Developments affecting Historic Buildings states that proposals involving additions or alterations to listed buildings or buildings of evident historic significance such as locally listed buildings (or their setting) should seek to conserve and where appropriate enhance that building's significance. In such circumstances proposals will be expected to:

- Respect historic precedents of scale, form, massing, architectural detail and the use of appropriate materials that contribute to the special interest of a building.
- Capitalise on opportunities to better reveal the significance of a building where elements exist that detract from its special interest.

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) Section 16 – Conserving and Enhancing the Historic Environment, states that in determining applications, local planning authorities should require an applicant to describe the significance of any heritage assets affected; the level of detail should be proportionate to the assets' importance. When considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation.

The relevant paragraphs of the NPPF reading this proposal are:

- Paragraph 195: Identify and assess heritage significance including the setting and the effect of a proposal
- Paragraph 199: Great weight given to an asset's conservation, irrespective of the degree of harm
- Paragraph 200: Any harm to or loss of significance will require clear and convincing justification
- Paragraph 200: LPA's should look for opportunities for development within conservation areas and within the setting of heritage assets that enhance or reveal significance

Where a proposed development will lead to substantial harm to or total loss of significance of a designated heritage asset, local planning authorities should refuse consent, unless it can be demonstrated that the substantial harm or loss is necessary to achieve substantial public benefits that outweigh that harm or loss

Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) - House Extensions sets out the design principles that specifically apply to the consideration of planning applications for house extensions, roof alterations, outbuildings & other domestic alterations. The general principles are that proposals for should:

- I. Be of a scale and design which harmonises with the existing building
- II. Not adversely affect the amenity of neighbouring properties
- III. Maintain the character of the street scene and
- IV. Not interfere with highway safety.

SPD – Trees and Hedgerows states that it is generally expected that trees protected by a TPO are retained and remain unaffected by any proposed development.

These policies are considered to reflect principles set out in the revised NPPF, which relates to high quality design and good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings.

Consultations

Conservation Officer – No objections subject to conditions

Forestry Officer – No objections

Ward Councillors – No comments received

Representations

None

Assessment

Principle of Development

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.

However, in accordance with Local Plan Policy HE1; development proposals need to demonstrate that the works follow the constraints of the building and have been approached in a manner which would help to conserve the historic asset in an acceptable manner.

Given the site has had a previous refusal for a side extension, the current application would need to overcome those reasons for refusal. Whether this has been achieved will be discussed under the headings below;

Residential Amenity

The proposed side extension would project towards the side elevation of 47 Victoria Road which has permission to be converted to apartments. The extension would be separated from the neighbouring building by a row of mature protected trees and a driveway. Furthermore, the proposed extension is relatively modest in size with a roof which slopes away from the neighbouring boundary and is orientated to the East. As such, the extension would not significantly increase overshadowing or be an overbearing feature.

In terms of the rear extension, it would be a significant distance to the dwelling to the rear and would adjoin an existing extension/projection which is located on the shared boundary with the adjoining property, as such, it would not be an overbearing feature, or significantly increase overshadowing, in accordance with Local Plan Policy GD1.

There are habitable room windows proposed on the side and rear elevations, however, these would either meet the required separation distances or have restricted views due to boundary treatments and mature trees/vegetation. As such, amenity levels for both existing and future residents would be acceptable, in accordance with Local Plan Policy GD1.

It should also be noted that the previously refused extension was predominantly 2 storey and on a similar footprint as proposed, however, it was not refused on residential amenity grounds.

Visual Amenity and Heritage Appraisal

This application follows refused application 2021/0108 which was refused for matters of unsympathetic design to the existing dwelling and the impact on the adjacent TPO trees.

The design was subsequently revised following comments by the Conservation Officer to include a substantial setback at the side which resolved initial concerns over the importance of retaining the symmetry of the front elevation. This revision retained the two-storey side element however issues and conflict with the adjacent TPO trees were not resolved due to the two-storey nature of the design.

Consequently, a further redesign took place and has been submitted as part of this application. The Conservation Officer has agreed that this is an acceptable compromise from the conservation perspective. The new proposal includes the substantial setback element on the side extension that was requested previously and is now single storey which will ensure it is visually deferential to the historic form and appearance of the historic building.

The retention and re-use of the decorative doorway with portico surround and balusters above, from the existing side elevation, is also a positive. The alterations to the rear, whilst not quite as sympathetic, are of much less concern being well out the public domain and The Conservation Officer agrees this will not impact on the conservation area negatively.

Given the comments above, the proposed extension now overcomes the first reason for refusal on the previous application, subject to conditions.

Other Matters

Adjacent to where the proposed extension will be located is a group of TPO trees, which present a constraint to the development and also formed the second reason for refusal on application 2021/0108.

The submitted arboricultural impact assessment demonstrates that the foundations can be installed without affecting the protected trees, due to the existing retaining wall. However, previously the proximity of the tree canopies to the proposed extension was a concern. This was because the canopies would need to have been cut back significantly to accommodate the first floor of the extension given the proximity and allow for a 3m clearance.

There is a history with this property of issues with overhanging branches over the roof and making contact with it etc. and frequent discussions over pruning back with some instances of permission being granted to do this (see application 2020/0295).

The pruning back to give 3m clearance from the existing dwelling and then filling this space with an extension would leave no room for the trees to grow without significant contact with the extension and would therefore mean that unless it was proposed to undertake continual trimming to maintain the trees at a significant cost, there is likely to be further applications to reduce the trees further, which is not appropriate.

By now removing the first floor element of the side extension, there is less pruning work required and there will be less future pressure for works to those trees. The Tree Officer is now content with the proposed extensions and is satisfied that the previous reason for refusal 2 has been overcome.

Summary

Considering the relevant development plan policies and other material considerations, it is not considered that there are any significant and demonstrable adverse impacts that would outweigh the benefits associated with the granting of planning permission for the revised scheme. The proposal therefore complies with the development plan as a whole and the advice in the NPPF.

As such the scheme is considered to accord with policies and guidelines and is recommended for approval.

Recommendation

Approve subject to conditions