

**Application Reference:** 2025/0082

**Site Address:** 36 Manor Fields, Great Houghton, Barnsley, S72 0BF

**Introduction:**

This application seeks full planning permission for a 2 storey side extension, and new hardstanding to front to create additional parking space, to 2 storey semi-detached dwelling

**Relevant Site Characteristics**

Located in on a modern housing estate in the village of Great Houghton, the dwelling is a red brick semi-detached dwelling with a tiled side gable roof. The dwelling features an original but recoloured light blue rendered front porch, a small enclosed front garden, and a driveway running alongside the side elevation but featuring a fence approximately halfway along, separating the front and rear gardens. The neighbouring dwelling of No.38 has a detached garage within their driveway, adjacent to the applicant’s driveway and proposed site of the extension. Unusually, the land almost directly behind the driveway of the application dwelling is part of the No.38’s large side and rear garden. The broader street scene comprises of predominantly larger detached dwellings but also includes some blocks of semi-detached houses such as the application dwelling.

**Site History**

<b>Application Reference</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Status (Approved/Refused)</b>
B/00/0630/HR	Residential Development - 98 dwellings	Approved

**Detailed description of Proposed Works**

A two-storey side extension is proposed to be constructed on the rear section of driveway, located next to the southern side elevation of the dwelling. The extension would feature a side projection of approximately 2.27m, a length of 6.95m, and feature an eaves height to match the original eaves height of 4.85m. The proposed ridge height of approximately 7.17m would be approximately 30cm lower than the original ridge height at of 7.47m. The proposal would be constructed of matching materials of red brick and feature a complementary styled roof design. The currently enclosed area of front garden would be re-surfaced to compensate for the loss of parking space caused by the construction of the extension.

**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. A site notice was also posted close to the development address, and a press notice published in the local newspaper.

No representations have been received.

Parish Council: No comments have been received.

Highways DC: Objection on the grounds of insufficient parking provision.

### **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 scale is of an acceptable size and is compliant with the local SPD House Extensions and Other Domestic Extension which require a side extension on a dwelling not to exceed two thirds of the width of the existing dwelling. Equally complaint is the set back of the extension from the front elevation of the dwelling, and a visible step down in the roof. Both these features illustrate subordination of the extension to the host dwelling. With local policy requirements met, it would be considered that the scale of the proposal would have a limited impact.

The design of the front elevation is fairly consistent with the design of the existing dwelling, this includes similar size and style of windows but only one of the two new windows feature architectural features found around the existing windows. Understandably, the existing first-floor side elevation window is not replaced within the extension as this may have created an

issue of overlooking the neighbouring dwelling No.38 dwelling, and almost certainly their garden. For the reason of protecting the amenity of No.38, the rear elevation is completely blank, and devoid of features. Whilst the design of the rear elevation would have a negative impact on the rear character of the dwelling, the design of the side elevation would be neutral, and the principal, front elevation would be acceptable. Therefore, the overall design and subsequent impact on the character of the dwelling would be moderate.

Within the broader street scene, it is not obvious which dwellings have been extended, and which feature original aspects akin to an extension. Whilst there does not appear to be a similar two-storey side extension for comparison purposes, and even given the fact the neighbouring garage would border the proposal; the extension would not be expected to cause a terracing effect as excluding the garage there is good separation between the neighbouring dwellings. Whilst the impact on the character of the original dwelling has been considered as moderate, primarily due to the rear elevation, the impact in relation to the street scene would be considered as modest.

With the current enclosed front garden required to be re-surfaced for compensatory parking provision, whilst there may be an impact on the loss of garden space, amenity space remains in the rear garden and the impact on the character of the dwelling or broader street scene would only be considered as having a limited impact.

#### Impact on Neighbouring Amenity

The proposal appears to have been designed to minimize its harm on neighbouring amenity. The side window of the rear elevation has not been replicated within the extension, and although considered as a negative design feature, the omission of any windows or doors on the rear of the extension eliminates the possibility of overlooking neighbouring dwellings or gardens, especially No. 38.

With the proposal being a side extension, there remains a possibility of overshadowing but with the good separation between the application dwelling and the unattached neighbouring dwelling of No.38, the only thing likely to be significantly overshadowed is their detached garage, but there may be a less of an impact on a small section of their rear, side garden. With the design of the proposal creating no privacy concerns, and with minimal potential overshadowing, the impact would be considered as limited.

#### Highways

Highways DC initially objected to the proposal on the grounds of insufficient parking provision and potential difficulty in accessing the proposed additional parking provision. On further review of the application, whilst sufficient parking provision at local policy standards, namely two spaces of a minimum size of 2.5m by 5m may not be completely met, it does come very close. Additionally, despite the side extension being constructed on what may have been original parking provision, evidence indicates that a side gate has restricted parking provision at the address for at least fourteen years, effectively rendering the dwelling with one parking space. On balance, with the proposal still providing an increase in available parking provision,

and with a condition to ensure such provision is constructed to the standards generally required by Highways DC, whilst the highways concerns has been noted, the actual impact would be considered as modest and not sufficient enough to merit refusal of the application.

#### 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**

It has been necessary to make contact with the applicant to request additional information but no amendments to the proposal during the consideration of the application have been made, as it was deemed acceptable.

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

**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.**