

2022/0287

Mr Pete Lane

Finlandia, 23 Cone Lane, Silkstone Common, Barnsley, S75 4PU

Extensions and alterations to existing dwelling

Site Description

The dwelling is a detached bungalow located in Silkstone Common. Cone Lane has a mixed residential street scene featuring a variety of dwelling types and materials used. The dwelling has a parking space and garden area to the front with a detached garage to the side. To the rear is a rear garden and existing single storey rear extension.

Proposed Development



The applicant is seeking approval for the raising of the dwelling's roof height to create first floor accommodation, the erection of a two-storey rear extension, single storey side extension and single storey front extension. The dwelling has a ridge height of 5.05 meters, to be increased by 1.9 meters to a proposed ridge height of 6.95 meters. The dwelling has an eaves height of 2.35 meters, to be increased by 0.1 meters at the highest point to a proposed eaves height of 2.45 meters.

The rear extension will project 2 meters from the rear elevation of the dwelling. The extension will span the full width of the dwelling. The extension will feature a pitched roof following the form of the proposed roof outlined above. The extension will feature a Juliet balcony to the rear. The materials used will be matching red brickwork and roof tiles as well as off-white render and silver birch cladding on the front and rear elevations.

The side extension will project 3.1 meters from the side (northeast) elevation of the dwelling. The extension has a width of 10.4 meters. The extension will feature a pitched roof to tie into the proposed roof with a ridge height of 5.48 meters where the side extension ends and an eaves height of 2.82 meters. The materials used will be matching red brickwork and roof tiles as well as off-white render.

The front extension will project 0.9 meters from the front elevation of the dwelling. The extension has a width of 4.35 meters. The extension will feature a flat roof with a total height of 2.9 meters. The materials used will be aluminium cladding.

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

Highways Development Control (DC) were 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, five objections were received and in summary raised the following points:

- 23 Cone Lane is elevated approximately 600mm above our property, due the slope of the hill the buildings sit on. This difference in elevation, and the side extension bringing 23 Cone Lane into closer proximity to our property, raises concerns over loss of skylight and sunlight.
- A mature, established beech hedge is located on our property and will immediately border the extension. We estimate the hedge will sit immediately adjacent to the extension, we estimate the hedge will run from the rear border of the utility room window of number 23, to the rear end of the proposed extension. We seek assurance that the building will not damage the root system or threaten the viability of the hedge which is an important feature of our garden and property.
- What are the plans for the existing drains and sewers, and how will the proposed development affect the shared sewers as the extension will sit over shared pipework.
- Will windows overlooking our property and garden be obscured. On the plan only the utility room window is annotated as being obscure glazed.
- The proposed balcony which is only 7 metres from our boundary and will overlook our property such that anybody on this balcony will be able to see into our bedroom, dining room and kitchen, causing a serious loss of privacy.

- The bedroom windows will also overlook our property such that anybody standing at this window will be able to look into our bedroom, dining room and kitchen also causing a serious loss of privacy.
- This development of 4 bungalows was all constructed in the late 1960's and early 1970's such that nobody overlooked each other when a small fence or hedge was in place. This conversion will cause a serious loss of privacy. No. 25 next door was modified with an extension but only on one level thus protecting everybody's privacy.
- The alterations to No. 23 will have a serious and permanent privacy problem for all the neighbours as the proposed upstairs will overlook all these properties and gardens.
- The proposed 3-metre-high hedge which is only 7.5 metres from our kitchen window will dominate the outlook and as the current hedge is only 1.6 m high will take years to grow up and is therefore totally unacceptable for privacy. A 3-metre hedge would be very difficult to maintain and as it is right on our boundary would necessitate them coming onto our land for cutting and maintenance.
- We have no objection to the re-designed balcony, incorporating a Juliette type balcony. We still have objections to the proposal for a 3m high hedge on the boundary of the property. The applicant wishes to maintain a view of the surrounding countryside from the balcony of the bedroom because they will be able to see over the hedge. However, the very same view will be denied to us by virtue of the proposed height of the hedge. Its current height is 1.6m.

Regarding drainage this is only a householder planning application and therefore drainage details do not have to be provided. Drainage will be addressed under building regulations. Potential issues during construction are not a material planning consideration and would be dealt with privately. Additionally, this is a householder application which doesn't require a construction method statement to be submitted. Also, the final amendment to the plans removed the 3-meter-high hedge and reduced the size of the balcony area so it is now just a Juliette balcony rather than a balcony where people can place tables and chairs on.

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.

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 the existing dwelling with matching brickwork and roof tiles being used as well as the further addition of off-white render and silver birch cladding. Render is featured in the street scene most notably at the neighbouring dwelling (25 Cone Lane) and therefore the use of render on the host dwelling especially on the front elevation would not be deemed harmful.

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"*. Cone Lane has a varied street scene with a variety of different features present on the front elevations in the street and little uniformity. The proposed changes to the front elevation of the host dwelling maintains similar features and balance all be it at

a larger scale. There are examples of front extensions in the street scene and a porch canopy extension as is proposed.

The SPD states that single storey side extensions “*should not have an excessive sideways projection (i.e. more than two thirds the width of the original dwelling)*”. A projection of two thirds of the original dwelling would be 5.26 meters and the proposed projection is to be 3.1 meters. Therefore, the proposed projection is acceptable.

The proposed roof is to reflect that of the existing roof in terms of style as the pitched roof form is maintained. With regards to the increase in roof height the neighbouring dwelling (21 Cone Lane) has a similar increase to create rooms in the roof space as well as other dwellings further along Cone Lane being two-storey dwellings.

Therefore, due to the street scene featuring both render and increased roof heights it is deemed that the proposal would not have a significantly detrimental impact upon the visual amenities of Cone Lane. The proposed development is therefore not considered to be contrary to Local Plan Policy D1: High Quality Design and Place Making and is considered acceptable in terms of visual amenity.

Residential Amenity

Extensions to residential properties are considered on the basis of overshadowing, loss of privacy and outlook. Roof alterations should be designed so that they do not result in significant overlooking of habitable room windows of neighbouring dwellings. There will be some increase in overshadowing and overbearance from the increased roof height, however this is unlikely to be significant for one of the adjacent property's (21 Cone Lane) as this dwelling is within the common building line and also has rooms in the roof space. This dwelling has a height approximately similar to the proposed height of the host dwelling which offsets the impact.

With regards to the other adjacent property (25 Cone Lane) the windows on the side elevation of this dwelling already have a loss of outlook due to the arrangement of the existing garages. The potential for overshadowing will occur over the roof of the property and not be significantly impactful to habitable room windows especially those on the front elevation.

The SPD states that “*two-storey rear extensions will be considered on the basis of the extent of overshadowing, loss of privacy and outlook*” and that “*extensions to the rear of detached houses will be considered on their design merits where no adjacent properties are affected*”. Whilst the proposed extensions including the raising of the roof height are fairly large and increase the size and scale of the dwelling, they would not cause significant harm in terms of overshadowing or being overbearing to a detrimental level. Furthermore, the proposed roof lights and slot windows proposed on the side elevations of the dwelling are small in scale and would not cause significant overlooking as they would predominantly overlook the side elevations of the neighbouring dwellings instead of any private amenity space.

The SPD states that “*10m should normally be provided between rear-facing windows in the first floor (and above) and the rear boundary*”. In this case the distance is approximately 8 meters. This recommendation is to protect overlooking of private amenity space however, the situation is different in this instance as the property to the rear, No.27, is accessed by a private drive which wraps around the back of the applicant's property so the applicant's rear elevation faces the neighbour's front/side elevation over a private road. The new windows at first floor would therefore not directly face onto the applicant's private rear amenity area and would be more akin to a situation of properties facing across a road rather than a situation where back gardens adjoin each other. Also, the bulk of No.27's property is behind No. 21 rather than the applicant's property at No.23. The rearwards projection is modest at only 2 metres and the new first floor rear window would only project 0.7m back from the existing rear elevation of the house. Furthermore, normally, balconies can cause significant overlooking into the private amenity space of neighbouring dwellings but in this situation, the

proposed balcony has since been amended to a Juliet balcony therefore limiting the impact of any potential overlooking.

For the above reasons whilst it is acknowledged that there will be some impact on neighbouring dwellings it is not considered that there will be any significant levels of overlooking or overshadowing to neighbours to warrant refusal of the application. Additionally, the proposed 3-meter-high planting has been omitted with the existing hedging to be maintained to prevent any overshadowing to the neighbouring property and responding to one of the concerns of the neighbour. The proposal is considered to be in compliance with Local Plan Policy GD1: General Development and is acceptable in terms of residential amenity.

Highway Safety

There will be no impact upon highway safety. The proposed provision of the dwelling will be unlikely to impact upon highway safety or the local highway network. It is noted that the proposed garage has dimensions of 2.9 meters x 6.569 meters which does not comply with South Yorkshire Residential Design Guide which requires single garages to have internal dimensions of 3 meters x 6 meters to be considered as a parking space. The proposed space to the front of the garage is approximately 6 meters long and therefore acceptable.

As the integral garage is 0.1 meters short in width of the recommendation a condition was requested requiring separate cycle storage to be provided. However, it is deemed that this condition request is not applicable for a development of this type considering the minimal impact of the discrepancy in the size of the proposed garage. An additional 1.65 sqm of space above the recommendation will be provided in the garage with dimensions of 2.9 meters x 0.569 meters which could be argued could accommodate a bicycle if the applicant wished to store one.

Recommendation

Approve with conditions