

2023/0430

Joe Schofield

4 West View, Beacon Hill, Silkstone Common, Barnsley, S75 4QF

Two storey side extension and single storey rear extension

Site Description

4 West View is the northern most dwelling of a pair of semi-detached properties. The properties have a close physical relationship with the railway and the immediately adjacent Hill Top Cottages. The cottages adjacent are grade II listed. In terms of West View, the two buildings have undergone minor change and alteration however, they retain their essential and characteristic Victorian appearance. Constructed in local black stained sandstone with ground floor bays (nos. 1 and 2), the properties include architectural stone dressings to openings, a front facing corbelled architrave parapet with central arched date stones and stone oversailing chimneys. The roofs are Welsh slate with verge coping and some decorative ridge tiles. Overall, these are middle status Victorian buildings that retain a good sense of their original appearance and architectural and historic quality.

Proposed Development



The applicant is seeking approval for the erection of a two-storey side extension and a single storey rear extension. The side extension will project 7.8 meters from the side (north) elevation of the dwelling. The extension has a width of 8.5 meters. The extension will feature a pitched roof with a ridge height of 8.5 meters and an eaves height of 5.7 meters. The materials used will be matching stone to the front and rear elevations with off white render to the side and matching roof tiles.

The rear extension will project 1.5 meters from the rear elevation of the dwelling. The extension has a width of 9.55 meters. The extension will feature a mono-pitched roof with a ridge height of 3.15 meters and an eaves height of 2.4 meters. The materials used will be matching stone and roof tiles.

Policy Context

Planning decisions should be made in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise and the NPPF does not change the statutory status of the development plan as the starting point for decision making. The Local Plan was adopted in January 2019 and is also now accompanied by seven masterplan frameworks which apply to the largest site allocations (housing, employment and mixed-use sites). In addition, the Council has adopted a series of Supplementary Planning Documents and Neighbourhood Plans which provide supporting guidance and specific local policies and are a material consideration in the decision-making process.

The Local Plan review was approved at the full Council meeting on 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.

Local Plan Allocation – Urban Fabric

To the extent that development plan policies are material to an application for planning permission the decision on the application must be taken in accordance with the development plan unless there are material considerations that indicate otherwise (section 70(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004).

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 – Development will be approved if 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 D1: High quality design and place making – Development is expected to be of a high-quality design and will be expected to respect, take advantage of and reinforce the distinctive, local character and other features of Barnsley.

Policy HE1: The Historic Environment – States that development which affects the historic environment and Barnsley's heritage assets, and their settings will be expected to protect or improve the character and/or appearance of Conservation Areas and Listed Buildings.

Policy HE3: Developments affecting Historic Buildings – Proposals involving historic buildings should conserve and where appropriate enhance, respect historic precedents, and capitalise on opportunities to reveal significance.

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 *"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"*.

Section 16: Conserving and enhancing the historic environment - Within section 16, paragraph 200 states *"any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset (from its alteration or destruction, or from development within its setting), should require clear and convincing justification"*. Substantial harm to or loss of:

- a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional;
- b) assets of the highest significance, notably scheduled monuments, protected wreck sites, registered battlefields, grade I and II* listed buildings, grade I and II* registered parks and gardens, and World Heritage Sites, should be wholly exceptional.

Consultations

The LPA's Conservation Officer was consulted and objected to the application.

The LPA's Forestry Officer was consulted and raised no objections subject to conditions.

Silkstone Parish Council were consulted and provided no response.

Representations

Neighbour notification letters were sent to surrounding properties as well as a site notice and press notice issued, three comments were received and in summary raised the following points.

- The Heritage Report states *"the side and rear elevations would adopt a more contemporary appearance and contrast with the original structure. In doing so, there be a clear distinction between 'old' and 'new' and thus the architectural language of the extended dwelling would be legible"*. This means the side and rear of the extension will be out of character with respect to the houses and existing extensions in West View, and this mismatch will be plain to see.

- I have been unable to find any compelling reason in the application why such a deviation of building style is necessary, and it doesn't preserve the architectural coherence of West View.
- Historically, vehicular access to all four houses in West View was at their rear. When 4 West View changed hands, a deal was apparently done to transfer land at the back of 4 West View to the property behind it known as Line View, thus blocking rear access to 4 West View.
- Instead, permission was sought from the owner of the private Beacon Hill spur to create vehicular access to 4 West View using the spur. This was done, I have to say, without any consultation with neighbours on the spur.
- Neither the owner of the lane nor the participants in the land exchange made any attempt to consult me or the owner of 1 Hilltop Cottages in advance, even though the new arrangements would clearly impinge on us. Inevitably, there is now rather more traffic and considerably more parking on the lane.
- The spur is a single-track, unmetalled lane with grass verges. It has no drainage, which means that heavy rain washes silt down it, creating standing water and mud at its low points.
- Major building work would inevitably increase pressure on the lane, potentially blocking it at times with parked and delivering vehicles, damaging the surface and creating yet more mud as contractors' vehicles park on the grass verges stripping them of grass.
- The side of the extension won't look traditional nor be in keeping with the adjacent houses.
- With all the glass in the side elevation, glass sliding doors and an oriel window, my cottage and garden will be completely overlooked, particularly by the upper-level oriel window.
- West View is elevated, and my cottage is below the level of the lane. It would very much invade my privacy. I am not overlooked at all now.
- The new extension will be a lot nearer to my property than the property currently is.
- Regarding the unmade lane down to our cottages, of which West View owners are now using as their access since it changed hands last year. It became very muddy last winter, with vehicles coming and going and vehicles parked up. I have concerns over the state the unmade lane will get in with all the work traffic.
- Great concern about possible obstruction in the lane in front of West View.
- This could make it extremely difficult for residents of Hilltop cottages and High Croft to get up and down the narrow lane.
- It would be helpful if it was stipulated that the proposed drive was completed before the building development was started. This would allow workers vehicles to park off the lane.

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, highway safety and in this case the setting of adjacent Listed Building.

Impact upon adjacent Listed Building

Firstly, regarding the impact upon the historic character of the host dwelling, the treatment of the new gable with the aluminium clad oriel window that projects at first floor level is a strongly discordant feature and results in an elevation that erodes the individual historic significance of West View. Allied to this is the out of scale proportions and appearance of the openings at ground floor level on all the altered elevations. These are generally overblown, horizontally emphasised and not in keeping with the existing historic openings.

However, the far greater issue is the impact the proposal will have on the setting of the designated grade II Hill Top. The gable in question is clearly visible from the setting of Hill Top Cottages when looking south. Currently the separation distance is 24 meters, but this will be reduced to approximately 17 meters when extended. Moreover, 4 West View is visible from numerous vantage points within the setting and the curtilage of Hill Top Cottages.

Currently this presents as a relatively neutral sandstone gable that harmonises and contributes to the setting in terms of its materiality and overall appearance. It is restrained and respectful to the setting. In contrast to this, the proposal intrudes on the setting and imposes its character much too strongly, eroding the setting and the significance of the listed building. As a result, this amounts to substantial harm to the setting of the listed building and is not justified. The proposal is not in accordance with Section 66(1) of The Act, Local Plan policies HE1 and HE3 or NPPF Para.200.

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 won't match the existing dwelling as off-white render is proposed to the side elevation of the extension instead of the natural stone that currently forms the existing side elevation of the dwelling.

The SPD states that *"the sideways projection of a two-storey side extension should not exceed more than two thirds the width of the original dwelling"* in order to ensure subordination and that the original dwelling stays as the dominant feature. A projection of two thirds the original dwelling is 4.26 meters, and the proposed projection is more than this at 6 meters and 7.8 meters when including the oriel window. Given the existing dwelling is 6 meters in width the proposed projection is unacceptable, and the extension would not be subservient to the original dwelling.

The SPD states *"all two-storey side extensions should therefore have a pitched roof following the form of the existing roof"*. The proposed extension utilises a pitched roof following the form of the existing pitched roof however the proposed set down from the main roof line is minimal and lacks a significant break line between the two roofs which results in an unbalanced proposed dwelling.

The SPD states *"to prevent a terracing effect and to avoid detrimental changes to the character of the street scene, it will be desirable to provide a setback of at least 500mm from the main front wall of the dwelling"*. The side extension is only setback 300mm from the front wall of the dwelling and additionally features a large bay window. The lack of a sufficient setback means the extension is not subordinate to the host dwelling and significantly impacts upon its character. The extension will not be viewed as an extension of the host dwelling. The form of the original dwelling is therefore not expressed and there will be an unsightliness of the bonding of the old and new facing materials.

Both the proposed front and side elevations of the extension feature extensive amounts of glazing which contrast from the character of the original dwelling especially on the side elevation which currently features no glazing. In addition, the introduction of an oriel window is an alien feature that is not complementary to the host dwelling or its surroundings. The proposed development is

therefore considered contrary to policies GD1 and D1 of the Local Plan and the Supplementary Planning Document House Extensions and Other Domestic Alterations.

Residential Amenity

The proposed side extension won't have a significant detrimental impact on any neighbouring property by way of overshadowing or being overbearing and the extension does not project beyond the existing front or rear elevations at first floor level. In terms of overlooking a lot of gazing is proposed on the side elevation of the extension and given its projection the distance between the extension and the property to the north (1 Hilltop Cottage) would be approximately 20 meters.

Other Matters

With regards to the highway's issues raised in the comments they are not pertinent to this householder planning application and would therefore have to be investigated separately.

Recommendation

Refuse