

Application Reference: 2025/0319

Location: 12 Guildford Road, Royston, Barnsley, S71 4HU.

Introduction

This application seeks planning permission for the erection of a two-storey side extension.

Relevant Site Characteristics

This application relates to a modest-sized corner plot located at the junction of Guildford Road with Buckingham Way and in an area that is principally residential characterised by detached bungalows and two-storey detached and semi-detached dwellings of similar scale and varying appearance.

The application property is a two-storey detached dwelling constructed of brick with a grey tiled gable pitched roof. Its north elevation is rendered and features a single storey stone-constructed projection forming a bay window. There is an existing single storey rendered extension to the rear (south) and an existing detached outbuilding and pergola structure to the south-west corner within the plot. The site is bounded by soft landscaping and a staggered low brick wall to the north and east. The height of the wall increases to the south and incorporates timber panels to the east and south boundaries. The site does not currently benefit from any off-street parking provision, but an area of slightly raised paving to the north fronting the boundary wall appears to be used for said purposes. The topography of the area falls gradually south-to-north and falls significantly east-to-west.



Site History

There is no planning history associated with the development site.

Detailed Description of Proposed Works

This application seeks planning permission for the erection of a two-storey side extension.

The proposed extension would measure approximately 7 metres (L) x 3.5 metres (W) x 7.2 metres (H). The proposed extension would comprise an integral garage and WC and first floor bedroom and en-suite and would be constructed of Pitch faced Calder buff weathered NewLay artificial stone and Double Roman tiles. The proposal also shows that part of the existing north boundary wall would be removed, and a new access and driveway formed.



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 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.

The development site is allocated as urban fabric within the adopted Local Plan which has no specific allocation. The following Local Plan policies are relevant in this case:

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

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

In December 2024, the Government published a revised NPPF which is the most recent revision of the original Framework, first published in 2012 and updated several times, providing the overarching planning framework for England. The NPPF 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. The 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 (paragraph 10) and plans and decisions should apply this presumption in favour of sustainable development (paragraph 11). There are three dimensions to sustainable development: economic, social and environmental; each of these aspects are mutually dependent. The following NPPF sections are relevant in this case:

- *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 this guidance 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 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.

Other Material Consideration(s)

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

Consultations

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. No representations were received.

Highways Development Control	<i>Objection.</i>
------------------------------	-------------------

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 of Development

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.

Impact on Highways

This application relates to a modest-sized corner plot located at the junction of Guildford Road with Buckingham Way and in an area that is principally residential. The proposal includes the formation of a new access and driveway to the north within the development site. It is noted that historic Google Street View imagery shows that a previous access to the development site off Buckingham Way has been removed, leaving the property without any formal off-street parking provision. An area of raised paving on the public footpath appears to be used for parking provision to the north. The site boundary is set behind this area which suggests it was designed to provide adequate visibility splays and sight lines at the junction of Guildford Road with Buckingham Way.

Highways Development Control were consulted, who stated that there were significant concerns in terms of highway safety because of the proposed access. The position of the proposed access would be directly adjacent to the junction with Buckingham Way and will fall within the radii of the junctions. The introduction of the access in this location could result in conflicting manoeuvres with road users when accessing and egressing the driveway. The length of the driveway also appears substandard. The minimum required driveway length is 6 metres, or 5.5 metres where a roller shutter door is used. A driveway length less than the minimum standards could result in vehicles overhanging the footway and causing an obstruction to pedestrians or restricting visibility for other road users. In addition, as the proposal includes an additional bedroom, increasing the existing provision from 3-bedrooms to a 4-bedroom dwelling, there is the potential for the associated parking demand to increase, and as per the Parking SPD, a minimum of 2 off-street parking spaces would be required to serve a dwelling

of 3-bedrooms or more. Consequently, an objection was raised from a highway's perspective. The LPA has no reason to disagree with the concerns raised in this instance.

Furthermore, the integral garage would fall short of the minimum internal spacing standards set out by paragraph B.1.1.23 within the SYRDG, which states best practice suggests the internal floor area for car spaces (garages or car ports) should be 3 x 6.5 metres. The proposed garage would measure approximately 3.2 metres x 6.4 metres. However, because of the inclusion of a WC within the garage the useable space for parking is greatly reduced.

Considering the above, this is considered to weigh significantly against the proposal.

The proposal is therefore considered contrary to Local Plan Policy T4: New Development and Transport Safety and is considered unacceptable regarding highway safety.

Scale, Design and Impact on Character

The House Extensions and Other Domestic Alterations SPD establishes specific design guidance in relation to two-storey side extension.

Paragraph 7.23 states that all two-storey side extensions should have a pitched roof that follows the form of the existing roof. To prevent a terracing effect and to avoid detrimental changes to the street scene character, a setback of at least 0.5 metres from the main front wall should be provided.

Paragraph 7.24 states that in addition to a setback from the front, where practicable, a side extension should also be set in by one metre from the side boundary with an adjacent property to further avoid a terracing effect.

Paragraph 7.25 states that the sideways projection of a two-storey side extension should not exceed more than two thirds the width of the original dwelling, and where located on a corner plot, it should not exceed more than half the width of the gap between a side elevation of the original dwelling and the side boundary (unless the gap exceeded more than two thirds the width of the original dwelling).

Paragraph 7.26 states that on a corner plot where the rear elevation is clearly visible, a setback of 0.5 metres should also be provided at the rear to ensure the extension remains subordinate and to avoid unsightly bonding of old and new materials.

In this instance, the proposed extension would adopt a pitched roof and would be set back from the front and rear elevations of the original dwelling by approximately 0.4 metres. It would be set in from the side boundary by approximately 1.7 metres and it would adopt a sideways projection that would not exceed two thirds the width of the original dwelling. The proposed extension would adopt a width greater than half the gap between the original dwelling and side boundary. However, the existing gap already exceeded two thirds the width of the original dwelling and therefore, the proposal is compliant in this instance. The extension would be constructed of sympathetic external materials, and existing boundary treatments, and topography differences would provide some screening benefit and likely lessen the prominence of the extension within the street scene.

Considering the above, this is considered to weigh moderately in favour of the proposal.

The proposal is therefore considered to comply with Local Plan Policy D1: High Quality Design and Placemaking and is considered acceptable regarding visual amenity. Nevertheless, a proposal that is considered acceptable regarding visual amenity does not justify the approval of a scheme that is considered unacceptable regarding highway safety.

Impact on Neighbouring Amenity

It is not considered that the proposal would contribute to significant overshadowing, overlooking and loss of privacy, or reduced outlook impacts which may otherwise adversely affect the amenity of the occupants of the application and neighbouring properties. The proposed extension would be erected on the east elevation of the application property and centrally within the development site and away from surrounding neighbouring properties. Sufficient separation distances would also be maintained to surrounding properties, in accordance with the House Extensions and Domestic Alterations SPD. Existing topography differences would also likely provide further mitigation. The proposal would also comply with the minimum internal space standards set out by Table 4.1 within the SYRDG.

Considering the above, this is considered to weigh moderately in favour of the proposal.

The proposal is therefore considered to comply with Local Plan Policy GD1: General Development and is considered acceptable regarding residential amenity. Nevertheless, a proposal that is considered acceptable regarding residential amenity does not justify the approval of a scheme that is considered unacceptable regarding highway safety.

Planning Balance and Conclusion

In accordance with the provision of paragraph 11 of the NPPF (2024), the proposal is considered in the context of the presumption in favour of sustainable development and therefore, for the reasons given above, and taking all other matters into consideration, whilst the proposal complies with the relevant local and national planning policies and guidance regarding visual and residential amenity, and the principle of development is acceptable, which weighs moderately in favour of the proposal, the reasons in favour of the proposal do not outweigh those against in this instance, and the proposal is considered unacceptable regarding highway safety, which is attributed significant weight against the proposal and as such, planning permission should 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 the planning application, in this instance this has not been possible due to the reasons mentioned above. Concerns raised by Highways Development Control were relayed to the Applicant via email on 23rd July 2025, and no response has been received as of 13th August 2025.

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.