Proposed Alterations to Form Extension to Dwelling, At 'Roselea' 6, Carr Head Road, Howbrook, Barnsley.

This report has been prepared by Simon M Elliott - Dip. URP. Of S.E.A. Planning Limited. The purpose of this report is to support the proposed development, as described above, at Roselea, 6, Carr Head Road, Howbrook, Barnsley S35 7HG.

1. Introduction

1.1 The purpose of this report is to highlight the relevant planning considerations and the merits of the proposed development, in planning terms. This report is to support the revised application for planning permission, which has been prepared by Garry Greetham Associates for the above-mentioned development and is to be considered along with that planning application. This application is for full planning permission for alterations and an extension to the existing split-level dwellinghouse, which represents a revision to the recently refused planning application, considered by the Council under application reference 2008/0912.

1.2 This report takes account of the current design and layout of 'Roselea' and its surroundings. Account has also been taken of the current Barnsley Unitary Development Plan (UDP) Policies and Supplementary Planning Guidance where they are relevant to the development that is proposed. This report also takes account of the previously refused planning application and in particular the reason given for the refusal of that application and the improvements that have been made to the original plans to overcome the Council's previous objections.

1.3 This report also takes account of other material planning considerations that are believed to be relevant to the proposed development or may have some influence on the LPA's decisions on this planning application. These including the design of the existing building and the merits of the proposed extension, and the Government's current stance relating to extensions to dwellings, particularly the emphasis towards allowing more development to be carried out within the curtilage of dwellings under the new 'permitted development' rights.

2. The Site & Surrounding Area

2.1 The site of the proposed development is at Roselea, which is a split –level two-storey dwellinghouse with an integral garage. The property fronts onto Carr Head Road, in the village of Howbrook, and is located within a hamlet of dwellings that vary quire greatly in terms of their size, design and external appearance. The dwelling gains access to Carr Head Road via a single access drive that only serves this property. The front elevation of the dwelling is set well back from Carr Head Road and is set down at a lower level than the road.

2.2 The application site itself is comprised solely of 'Roselea', which is a substantial brick-built dwellinghouse with interlocking concrete tiled roofs. This property has a relatively modern design and has not been significantly altered of extended since it was originally built.

2.3 The application site is located in a semi-rural setting with views at the rear over the valley, and the ground floor level and garage are set at a lower level than the highway. The land to the rear of the site continues to fall away from the site boundary, and is made up of a number of open fields. The main view of the proposed development would be from Carr Head Road and it is considered that the development, as now proposed, would sit very well against the design of the existing dwelling and its immediate surroundings.

3. Planning Policy & Other Material Considerations

3.1 This application has been prepared as a revised scheme following the recent refusal of a previous planning application. The previous proposal was for a larger extension than the one now proposed and planning permission was refused for the following reason:
"In the opinion of the Local Planning Authority the proposed extension would be contrary to Policy H8E of the Unitary Development Plan and the Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance Note 4 in that its design and size would be architecturally inconsistent with the character of the property and would as a consequence appear as an unduly intrusive feature in the street scene to the detriment of visual amenity."

3.2 In terms of the design of the previously submitted proposal it gave the appearance of a somewhat overbearing extension, when viewed from the highway which was due to the eaves height of the extension being approximately 700mm above the height of the existing eaves level, a blank wall of plain brickwork above the existing windows and a ridge level that would have been in line with the ridge of the main part of the existing house.

3.3 The original plans have now been amended and they propose an extension that is considered will comply with the guidance given in Policy H8E of the UDP and SPG Note 4. The previous reason for the refusal of planning permission makes it clear that the Council's primary concern relates to the impact of the proposed extension on the visual amenity of the street scene. It was obviously considered that the previously submitted plans did not propose an extension that was architecturally consistent with the existing building.

3.4 The originally submitted plans have now been revised and the eaves level of the front elevation has been reduced by 700mm to be consistent with the eaves level of the existing house. This has resulted in a reduction in the amount of brickwork that will be visible above the existing first floor windows. It is considered that these amendments represent a significant improvement in the design and external appearance of the proposed extension, resulting in an extension that is consistent with the design and external appearance of the existing house. It has also been decided to reduce the height of the ridge of the roof of the extension so that it falls below the ridge of main part of the house, which runs at a right angle to the new roof. It should be noted that the part of the house where the extension is proposed is set back from the front wall of the house by over 3.5 metres. This will ensure that not only will the proposed extension be architecturally consistent with the original dwelling but it will also be viewed as a clearly subservient extension to the original dwelling and not as an unduly intrusive feature when viewed within the street scene.

3.5 In terms of the Planning Policies and Guidance notes that are considered to be relevant to this proposal I wish to highlight the following:
UDP Policy H8E, which relates to Proposals to Extend Dwellings.
Supplementary Planning Guidance Note 4 (SPG 4), which provides more detailed advice on the design and size of House Extensions.

3.6 **Policy H8E** advises that proposals to extend dwellings should:

A) Be of a scale and design which harmonises with the existing building.
B) Not adversely affect the amenity of neighbouring properties.
C) Maintain the character of the street scene, and
D) Not interfere with highway safety.

3.7 **SPG 4** provides more detailed advice on house extensions and includes a section on Design Principles. This is the only part of SPG 4 that is referred to in this report as the previously submitted application was only refused on design grounds. SPG 4 advises that "It is important that any extension is designed to be in keeping with your property and the character of your neighbourhood. Therefore, before designing the extension, examine the character and details of your house. An extension will tend to be more successful if you follow these guidelines.

Building Form – the extension should not normally be larger than the existing house.

Roof – The roof style, pitch and details should match those of the existing house, particularly where the extension will be prominent within the street scene or extend on parallel lines at a smaller scale.

Materials – Materials should normally be of the same size, colour and texture to the existing house or as close a match as possible. Where materials cannot be exactly matched, a small set-back of the extension from the main wall by at least one course of bricks can avoid the unsightly bonding of old and new.

Details – Windows and doors should generally repeat the proportion and style of the existing dwelling, lining through with existing openings and using matching design details such as heads and sills.

Levels – Where the height of development proposed differs significantly from that in the area, developers may be asked to provide elevation drawings showing the relationship between the proposed and existing development in terms of streetscape.

3.8 There is also a section in SPG 4, which is entitled **Side Extensions**. However, it is not considered that the content of this section is particularly relevant to the development that is now being proposed. It is considered that with the amendments that have been made to the original plans the proposed extension will be viewed as a complementary addition to the existing dwelling. The detailing of the proposed works will fit in very well with the external appearance of the existing building form, as viewed from Carr Head Road. The 'extension' is already set back from the front wall of the house by over 3.5 metres and the external facing materials will match those on the existing building in all respects. A note to this effect is included on the submitted plans.

3.9 The design and external appearance of the proposed extension will also match the character of the existing house, as it is clear from viewing the exterior of the building that this is a split-level dwelling. The relative heights of the windows to the left and right of the dwelling make this clear and this extension will merely replicate that existing character.

3.10 The proposed extension represents only a minor addition to the existing house and neither the design nor the size of the proposed extension is architecturally inconsistent with the character of the existing property. As such, this extension would not appear as an intrusive feature in the street scene. There is a great deal of variety in the size and design of all of the houses and bungalows along this stretch of Carr Head Road and this small addition to one of those dwellings will not have an adverse effect on the area as a whole in any conceivable way.

4. Conclusions

4.1 In conclusion it is my opinion that the extension to the existing dwelling, as now proposed, represents an acceptable form of development along Carr Head Road. The existing dwellings immediately adjacent to this property vary greatly in terms of their size, design and external facing materials. There is no constant theme running through the dwelling adjacent to this site and it is therefore considered that the proposed extension will not be materially detrimental to the character or visual amenity of the street scene.

4.2 The existing dwelling id a substantial split-level house and the proposed extension will still be viewed as a subservient structure to the main body of the house. It is considered that the changes that have been made to the appearance of the extension will not have a materially detrimental impact on the visual amenity of the area or the amenities of neighbouring residents. Quite the opposite, it is felt that this development will represent an attractive addition to this property and will not be contrary to any of the Council's UDP Polices or guidelines outlined above in this report.

4.3 It is clear that this proposal will not be materially detrimental to the character of the area. The access and parking spaces to the property already exists and the proposed development will not have an adverse impact on the interests of highway safety. As viewed from outside the site the appearance of the dwelling will remain generally as it does at present.

4.4 The construction of the proposed extension is not considered to represent an unacceptable form of development in this location. The overall effect of the new development will not represent a significant addition to this property or a detriment to the visual amenity of the locality. Therefore, the Council is respectfully requested to grant planning permission for the proposed development, subject to conditions as are typical for this type of development as are deemed to be necessary, in line with the advice contained in Circular 11/95.