2022/0832

Mr T Ellis

59 Old Royston Avenue, Royston, Barnsley, S71 4FZ

Single storey rear extension and bay window extension at front of dwellinghouse

---

Site Description

The dwelling (59 Old Royston Avenue) is a detached property located in Royston. Old Royston Avenue has a consistent street scene including dwellings of similar size, type and external materials used. The dwelling is set on a staggered building line and occupies a corner plot adjacent to Old Royston Avenue and Shepherd Way.

To the front of the dwelling is a small, grassed area and pathway forming an entrance to the dwelling. The front elevation features a canopy over the front door.

To the rear of the property are patio and garden spaces along with access to a detached garage. Beyond the rear garden fencing is a hard surfaced driveway, and further access to the garage is achieved from the highway.

Planning History

2012/1337 - Full application for erection of 143 dwellings, supermarket (Class A1), petrol filling station, additional parking for community campus, public open space, landscaping access, parking and outline application for health centre (Class D1) with all matters – Approved Subject to Legal Agreement.

2017/1117 - Discharge of conditions 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 12, 13, 14, 16, 18, 25, 28, 30, 31, 32, 33, 36 of 2012/1337- Erection of 143 dwellings, supermarket, petrol filling station, additional parking, public open space, landscaping access, parking, and outline application – Approve.

Proposed Development

The applicant is seeking approval for a *"Single storey rear extension and bay window extension at front of dwellinghouse".*

The proposed rear extension would project 3.50 metres from the rear elevation and would have a width of 5.46 metres. A lean-to roof is proposed with provisions for two roof lights included. This roof type would reflect the pitch and style of the existing roof of the original dwelling and would have a total height of 3.65 metres and an eaves height of 2.42 metres.

The proposed bay window extension to the front would project 1.20 metres from the front elevation and would have a width of 2.41 metres. A lean-to roof is proposed and would have a total height of 3.33 metres and an eaves height of 2.37 metres.

The materials used throughout the rear extension and the bay window extension to the front would be matching as close as possible to the original dwelling, brickwork, roof tiles, and PVC to match the existing style and colour of windows and doors. Aluminium is proposed for the doors of the rear extension.



Policy Context

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

Local Plan Allocation – Urban Fabric

The Barnsley Local Plan (BLP) was adopted at the full Council meeting held 3rd January 2019. In addition, the Local Authority (LPA) has adopted a series of Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD), and Neighbourhood Plans which provide supporting guidance and specific local policies and are a material consideration in the decision-making process. In reference to this application, the following policies are relevant:

Policy SD1: Presumption in favour of Sustainable 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.

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.

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.

Supplementary Planning Document: House extensions and Other Domestic Alterations

This document establishes 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 should;

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

The above principles are to reflect the revised principles in the NPPF, which promote high quality design and a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings.

National Planning Policy Framework

The NPPF sets out the Government's planning policies and how these are expected to be applied. The core of this is a presumption in favour of sustainable development. Proposals that align with the Local Plan should be approved unless material considerations indicate otherwise. In respect of this application, relevant policies include:

Section 12: Achieving well designed places - The Government attaches great importance to the design of the built environment. Good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, creates better places in which to live and work and helps make development acceptable to communities. It is important to plan positively for the inclusion of high-quality design for all developments, including individual buildings, public and private spaces, and wider area development schemes.

Within section 12, paragraph 134 states that *"development that is not well designed should be refused, especially where it fails to reflect local design policies and government guidance on design, taking into account any local design guidance and supplementary planning documents such as design guides and codes"*.

Consultations

No consultees were consulted for this application.

Representations

Neighbour notification letters were sent to surrounding properties; no objections or comments were received.

Assessment

Principle of Development

The site falls within urban fabric which has no specific land allocation; however, the site and surrounding area is made up principally of housing. Extensions to residential properties are

considered acceptable where they do not have a detrimental impact on the amenity of surrounding residents, visual amenity, and highway safety.

Residential Amenity

The SPD states that *"Extensions to the rear of detached houses will be considered on their design merits where no adjacent properties are affected."*

59 Old Royston Avenue forms part of a staggered building line with neighbouring properties, as such, the proposed rear extension would be set-back from neighbouring 57 Old Royston Avenue, and it would be of a similar size and resemble a similar style to the existing extension of No. 57.

As such, the proposed rear extension would not have any detrimental impact by way of overshadowing or being overbearing. The proposed utilisation of a lean-to roof coupled with a restrained roof height would protect access to sunlight and substantially limit any potential impacts.

The existing set-back that the original dwelling benefits from would ensure that privacy is maintained to the rear private garden and the rear habitable room windows of neighbouring 57 Old Royston Avenue, even when the proposed rear extension is considered.

To further address overlooking the SPD states that *"A distance of 12 metres should be maintained to a blank gable wall and a distance of 10m should normally be provided between rear-facing windows on the first floor (and above) and the rear boundary."*

A distance of 10.2 metres would be achieved between the rear-facing windows/ doors of the proposed rear extension and the rear boundary. The proposed extension would be of a single storey and the rear boundary is screened by an existing detached garage and 2-metre-high fencing. As such, there is unlikely to be any detrimental impact on neighbouring property 44 Shepherd Way regarding overlooking and loss of privacy.

Therefore, when considering the above, it is deemed that the proposed rear extension would not have a significant detrimental impact on any neighbouring property by way of overshadowing, being overbearing, or by way of overlooking resulting in a loss of privacy. As such, the proposed rear extension is considered to be in compliance with the guidance outlined within the SPD and would be acceptable in terms of residential amenity.

Regarding the proposed bay window extension to the front, the SPD states that *"Extensions at the front of individually designed, detached houses, which are set back from the highway or set on staggered building lines, may, in certain circumstances, be acceptable. However, the extension must complement the original house and not adversely affect any adjacent property or the street scene."*

59 Old Royston Avenue is set on a staggered building line with neighbouring properties and benefits from a minimal set-back from the highway. The dwelling is set forward of neighbouring properties and when considered with the modest size of the proposed extension, it would be unlikely that the proposed bay window would have any detrimental impact by way of overshadowing, being overbearing, or by way of overlooking resulting in a loss of privacy. As such, the proposed bay window extension is considered to be in compliance with the guidance outlined within the SPD and would be acceptable in terms of residential amenity.

Visual Amenity

The SPD states that '*materials should normally be of the same type, colour and texture to the existing house or as close a match as possible'*. In this case, the proposed materials will match or as closely match as possible to the existing dwelling with brickwork, roof tiles, PVC windows and Aluminium doors.

Whilst Aluminium is not a material seen within the original dwelling, it is a sympathetic material choice in terms of colour and texture that would adequality compliment the original dwelling, therefore, its use would be acceptable in this instance.

Both proposed rear and bay window extensions would be visible from public viewpoints, however, the proposed rear extension has the benefit of being screened by a 2-metre-high boundary fence.

The proposed rear extension incorporates a lean-to roof which reflects the style and pitch of the roof of the original dwelling and surrounding properties. The roof would utilise matching or as closely matched as possible roof tiles to the original dwelling whilst other closely matched materials are also proposed.

The proposed bay window extension also incorporates a lean-to roof which reflects the style and pitch of the roof of the original dwelling and surrounding properties and again, matching or closely matched materials are proposed.

The SPD states that *"Windows and doors should generally repeat the proportion and style of the existing dwelling, lining through with existing openings and using matching design details. This should also include the heads, sills and other opening surrounds."*

In this instance the proposed bay window would replace an existing window and as such, the proportion and style would be repeated, and existing opening lines would be followed.

Whilst there is no evidence of other bay windows within the street scene there are features to other dwellings that resemble porches and front extensions.

Therefore, when considering the above it is deemed that the proposed bay window extension would be an appropriate addition that is sympathetic to the original dwelling and maintains the character of the street scene. The proposed rear extension would also be a sympathetic addition to the dwelling and there would be minimal impact upon the character of the street scene due to existing boundary screening. As such, both the proposed bay window extension to the front and the rear extension are considered to be in compliance with the guidance outlined within the SPD and would be acceptable in terms of visual amenity.

Highway Safety

There will be no impact upon highway safety.

Recommendation

Approve with Conditions