

PLANNING and DESIGN and ACCESS STATEMENT

OUTLINE APPLICATION FOR A DWELLING

Adjacent to

66 Longfields Crescent, Hoyland Barnsley S74 9JA

PROPOSAL

- 1.This is an outline application with all matters reserved.
- 2.The garden of 66 Longfields Crescent is relatively large on this housing estate with a significant proportion of land at the side of the dwelling.



Figure 1 Application site in the context of the wider estate



Figure 2 Close view of site

- 3.The site currently contains two prominent and unsightly garages, which will be removed to accommodate the scheme.
- 4.The application is for a dwelling with a house as a first preference but the applicant would be willing to accept single-storey development if this was deemed necessary.
- 5.The displacement of the parking to serve 66 Longfields Crescent would be provided at the front of that property
- 6.The submitted plan shows an indicative siting of a dwelling



Figure 3 View of site from the front



Figure 4 View of front of 66 Longfield Crescent

PLANNING POLICY ASSESSMENT

7. There appears to be no objection in principle to the development on the basis that the site is in a housing area on the UDP Proposals map.

8. Clearly the proposal has to conform to UDP policy H8D, which states

“PLANNING PERMISSION FOR INFILL, BACKLAND OR TANDEM DEVELOPMENT INVOLVING SINGLE OR A SMALL NUMBER OF DWELLINGS WITHIN EXISTING RESIDENTIAL AREAS WILL ONLY BE GRANTED WHERE DEVELOPMENT WOULD NOT RESULT IN HARM TO THE LOCAL ENVIRONMENT OR THE AMENITIES OF EXISTING RESIDENTS, CREATE TRAFFIC PROBLEMS OR PREJUDICE THE POSSIBLE FUTURE DEVELOPMENT OF A LARGER AREA OF LAND. “

9. The criteria to assess the impact of the development are made more specific in the Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Document "Designing New Housing Development" in section 19 regarding infill development. These criteria are expressed below and the merits of the scheme are discussed in relation to each one as follows:

10. Dwellings should be orientated to have a frontage to the existing public highway. Sides and backs and garages should be sensitively located so the frontage of the new development integrates with the existing street scene.

11. The dwelling will have a principal elevation, which faces the highway frontage. The side elevation facing Longfield Crescent can be fenestrated to ensure it does not present a blank intrusion into the street scene.

12. The space between the proposed dwelling and adjacent dwellings should reflect the prevailing character of the street.

13. It will have a similar front and rear garden depth as these dwellings and will be in accordance with the prevailing grain of development on this estate.

14. The siting of the dwelling should reflect the building line of the dwellings on the same side of the street

15. The dwelling will be on the same front and rear building line as the existing dwellings on the main limb of Longfield Crescent.

16. The eaves and ridge heights of dwellings should usually be comparable with the heights of adjacent dwellings.

17. This can be readily achieved.

18. Parking provision should be accommodated in a similar manner to how it is accommodated elsewhere on the street (e.g. if existing dwellings are set forward on their plots with parking at the side, the proposed dwelling should not be set back with parking at the front).

19. There are a number of dwellings along Longfield Crescent and elsewhere on this estate that have modified front gardens to accommodate parking. This scheme will result in the provision of parking at the front of 63 Longfield Crescent and potentially parking at the side of the proposed dwelling.

20. It is understood that parking in front gardens can erode the character of the street scene when done in an extensive manner, producing large areas of sterile hard-surfaced parking. This scheme will incorporate sensitive landscaped parking areas in a porous surface. There will be a consequent improvement in the street scene due to the removal of the large flat roofed concrete garages and extensive drive width.

21. Architectural features, fenestration and materials should reflect the positive elements elsewhere on the street.

Infill development should not be piecemeal so as to prejudice potential comprehensive development of a larger area of land. Landscaped features such as trees, particularly those prominent in the street scene, should be retained and provided with sufficient space for future growth.

22. These criteria are clearly relevant to a reserved matters submission. It is worthwhile to point out that the applicant is committed to a design, which is complimentary to the existing dwellings and is prepared to incorporate an extensive landscape scheme to improve the street scene.

IMPACT ON NEIGHBOURS

23. Section 3 of the SPD specifies various external space standards.

24. The proposed dwelling will tie in with the existing building lines and front and rear garden areas.

25. The rear garden depth on the proposed indicative siting is 6 metres, which falls short of the 10-metre guideline. However, the

neighboring gardens at 68 & 44 Longfields Crescent are also of these dimensions. A number of gardens on the estate for example on Royston Hill fall short of the 10-metre guideline. The shortfall in rear garden space is more than adequately compensated for by the large curtilage (782 sq. metres) and the sizeable side and front garden areas such that the effective rear garden area is significantly more than the 60 sq. metre guideline. The rear garden even if measured just in terms of the immediate space to the rear of the dwelling, excluding side garden, provides 54 square metres.

26. The distance between the rear of the indicative dwelling and the side gable of 66 Longfields Crescent is 14 metres, which meets the 12-metre guideline.

27. This is a flat site with no potential for unreasonable overlooking, intrusive massing impacts or restriction of daylight and sunlight.

28. The SPD states in paragraph 6 *“Each case will be judged on its merits but detailed information must be submitted to demonstrate that adequate levels of amenity would be retained for existing residents and provided for residents of proposed dwellings “*

30. It is considered that the above demonstrates that the proposal will not impact on the amenity of existing residents.

SUMMARY

31. This proposal will assist the Council in combating its shortage of housing land supply as identified in the SHLAA, April 2012 and meeting the requirements of paragraph 47 of the NPPF.

32. The proposal will secure improvements in the street scene by removal of two prominent and unsightly garages and the introduction of a sensitively designed dwelling in a landscaped setting.

33. There is no unreasonable overlooking or detrimental impact which would reduce the amenities of neighbouring residents.

