

Overview

This planning application is a redesign and resubmission of Planning Application Reference 2021/0987. We have addressed all of the Planning Officers concerns and now hope that we can come to a new resolution regarding an extension at 33 Allendale Road. This cover letter and the other accompanying documents demonstrate how we have addressed the problematic elements of the earlier submission. If there are any problems with any of the design items, please don't hesitate to contact us on the details above.

Schedule of Information

1. 33 Allendale Rd 33AR-Ext CIL Questionnaire
2. 33 Allendale Rd 33AR-Ext Cover Letter (**this document**)
3. 33 Allendale Rd 33AR-Ext Design and Access Statement
4. 33 Allendale Rd 33AR-Ext Existing Elevations
5. 33 Allendale Rd 33AR-Ext Existing Floorplan
6. 33 Allendale Rd 33AR-Ext Flood Map
7. 33 Allendale Rd 33AR-Ext Proposed Elevations
8. 33 Allendale Rd 33AR-Ext Proposed Floorplan
9. 33 Allendale Rd 33AR-Ext Site and Location Plan

Original Officer Report

For brevity, and ease of reference, we have copied the assessment section of the Officer Report from the rejected application below. We have also numbered the sections where we have taken the officers notes into account for the redesign. The points are addressed one by one at the end of Officer Assessment

Officer Assessment

Principle of development

The site lies within designated Urban Fabric in the adopted Local Plan. As such extensions and alterations to a domestic property are acceptable in principle provided that they remain subsidiary to the host dwelling, are of a scale and design which is appropriate to the host property and are not detrimental to the amenity afforded to adjacent properties.

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

Residential Amenity

Extensions to residential properties are considered based on their impact in terms of overshadowing, overbearing, loss of privacy and outlook on neighbouring dwellings.

The extension does not project beyond the front or rear elevations of the property, and only extends 1m beyond the rear building line of the dwelling to the South. The entirety of the extension sits below the 45° line and so it is unlikely to cause detrimental levels of overshadowing or overbearing to the neighbouring dwelling

1The granny flat is located at lower ground floor level, separate from the main living facilities of the dwelling, and could be served by a separate access down the side of the dwelling, as a 1.5m gap to the side boundary is retained. No supporting information is provided as to the occupancy or requirement for the granny flat, which raises concerns about the future sub-division of the property into separate planning units. Dedicated parking could be provided to the front of the dwelling, and pedestrian access provided down the side, with the granny flat and main dwelling sharing rear amenity space.

As such, the proposed granny flat is considered unacceptable, especially in the absence of any explanation of the relationship between the intended occupants and those of the host dwelling.

Visual Amenity

Side extensions should reflect the design of the existing dwelling in terms of roof style, materials and detailing, and should also not have an excessive sideward projection (i.e. more than 2/3 the

width of the original dwelling). Normally, rooms within the roof space of a single storey extension would be unacceptable, particularly where the eaves would be increased, and the roof pitch altered so that it awkwardly juxtaposes with the existing dwelling. Furthermore, it becomes difficult to provide adequate light provision and outlook without incorporating dormer windows, which can be detrimental to the existing character of the host property.

²The main issue is the impact of the proposal upon the street scene and visual amenity of the area. It is considered that the scale and design of the raised roof, with its changes in pitch and higher apex, would appear overly dominant and of much greater massing than others in the street scene. In addition, the eaves to ridge ratio would out of proportion in relation to the main dwelling:

	<u>Central Elevation</u>	<u>Left Elevation</u>	<u>Extension</u>
Eaves	4.75m	4.4m	2.8m
Roof	2.5m	2.9m	3.8m
Total	7.3m	7.3m	6.6m
Eaves/Ridge Ratio	65/35	60/40	42/58

The height of the proposed extension is 2.8m to the eaves and 6.6m with the proposed roof making up approx. 58% of the total height compared to 35-40% as existing. Furthermore, the eaves to ridge ratio gives a top-heavy appearance to the extension, awkwardly juxtaposing with the existing dwelling. The dwelling is in a prominent position, being highly visible along Allendale Road ³It is considered that the proposed extension would appear as an incongruous feature in the street scene, harmful to the character and visual appearance of the local area.

⁴Although the side extension does not exceed the maximum allowance of 2/3 the width of the original building – as set out in SPD guidance – the proposal results in an elongated fenestration of 14.3m in width, with an unsympathetic roof design which unbalances the property when viewed in the context of the surrounding dwellings. It is acknowledged that the dwelling opposite has a wide front elevation, with a flat roofed double garage attached to the side elevation of the property. However, this has less impact on the wider street scene due to the low overall height of the attached garage. Were a proposal submitted for a first floor extension over this, it would likely be refused.

⁵Front dormers are not characteristic of the street scene however, the impact of the proposed new dormers is negated somewhat by the overall detrimental effect the extension as a whole has on both the main property and wider street scene.

6The principle aims of local and national design policies are to support and encourage developments which are appropriate to their context and enhance the character and appearance of the area in which they sit. These aims can be found in the supporting text to Local Plan Policy D1 and SPD – House Extensions and other Domestic Alterations, as well as Para. 128-132 of the NPPF.

As the proposed extension would achieve neither of those aims on the basis it would appear as a prominent and alien feature in the street scene of Allendale Road and its presence would be at odds with and erode the character of the area. As such, the proposal is considered to be contrary to the aforementioned policies and is not acceptable.

Officer Assessment - Point by Point

1. The Granny Annex

The officers' notes here are understandable but wrong. The design submitted to us by the architect clearly showed a door from the main dwelling to the annex. We must concede, however, that they do not appear on the plans in the submission. However the annex is *actually for* an ailing family member. They are becoming increasingly immobile and having them move into an annex with us allows them to retain most of their independence whilst still being much closer to us in the increasing chance of emergency. There is no intention or desire to ever subdivide the property.

2. The Proposed Roof Pitch

We agree wholeheartedly with the officers' assessment of the dominance of the proposed roof. We have redesigned the look of the build and altered the roof pitch to match the host property. Although a liberal interpretation of guidance 6.10 in the Supplementary Planning Document: House Extensions and Other Domestic Alterations has been taken it has significantly altered the look of the proposed extension and now harmonises much better not only with the host dwelling, but with the wider street scene as a whole. Further details can be found in Section 8 - Roof Design of the Design and Access Statement.

3. Incongruous Appearance

The redesign of the roof is not the only stylistic choice that we feel has addressed the officers' thoughts on the proposed extensions incongruous appearance. We have altered the width of the proposed extension to more centrally focus the bay window and balance the host property, giving a much more visually appealing style. It also brings the dwelling in line with the other properties on the street, reinforcing

the street scene. Further details of this can be found in Section 8 - Roof Design and Section 8 - Upper Storey Design of the included Design and Access Statement.

4. An Elongated Fenestration

By balancing the host property with the first floor extension it no longer looks elongated. The double garage width has also been reduced from the original proposed plans. However the over-subordination of the garage roof goes much further in breaking up the total elongation than the reduction in width. We are much happier with the look and feel of the new proposal.

5. Front Dormers

The redesign of the double garage and first floor extension has removed the necessity for dormer windows and these are now no longer an issue.

6. Appropriate Context and Character

The newly redesigned proposal has had much more research go into not only the character of the host property but also the street scene as a whole. Considerations have been taken against the whole street and surrounding properties before the redesign took place. Unifying the roof style to match the street may be a bold change in terms of the host property but will have a much greater positive impact on the street scene. Reducing the overall width of the extension has created a focal point, and made a feature, of the full height bay, whilst not overbearing or imbalancing the appearance of the host property. Many of the beautiful features of the property will be retained or rebuilt to further integrate the extension into the fabric of the existing property. Further details and images of this can be seen in the Design and Access Statement.

Further Design Choices

1. Further Information on the Annex

We feel it is imperative to note, that while we had always planned at some point to apply for an extension to the property, the time for doing so has significantly accelerated forward due to the rapid deterioration of a close family member, Sophie's grandmother, Janet. Janet expressed her desire to move in with us at the end 2020 and has since had numerous falls and near misses. Day by day she is getting more infirm. She is in her middle 80's and her increasing mobility issues are being frequently treated by medical professionals. Mobility is her single biggest

issue and the benefit she would get from a living space on a single level storey would be immeasurable. She is eligible for a blue badge and her NHS appointments are getting more frequent (in which we collect and return Janet to her current home). There would be a significant benefit to her moving in with us and having us closer at hand for the increasing likelihood of an emergency. The next step, recommended by medical professionals, was having in-home carers, which she is dead set against and also one of the reasons why she agreed to move into our home with us. The other reason being, she was born and raised on Carrington avenue (and remembers the family who built this house)

2. Window Styles and Positions

Window styles on the front and rear elevations were direct copies of their existing counterparts. Windows to the ground floor side elevation to be obscured, but they face a correspondingly obscured window on the property to the south. The windows to the lower ground floor side elevation look out onto the garden wall. The only window that had potential overlooking privacy concerns was the first floor rear elevation. Whilst it is above 30m away from the nearest habitable room of a neighbouring property, we still consulted the neighbours (as detailed in Section 7 - Privacy and Community Engagement in the Design and Access Statement) and reached a satisfactory conclusion with the placement of some seedless evergreens to the southerly most aspect of the rear boundary.

3. Security in the Design

As noted in Safer Places - The Planning System and Crime Prevention (ODPM 2004), and also in the Supplementary Planning Document: House Extensions and Other Domestic Alterations, the rear and side elevations are the most common point of egress or nefarious activity. The side elevation windows of the ground floor are all beyond the retaining wall so remain largely unreachable and the rear garden is fenced and locked at all times. The annex to the rear will also have an almost permanent presence. Further to this, all doors and windows will meet the Secured By Design specification and be manufactured by a reputable certificate holder from the Secured By Design website.

4. Sustainable Development

Sustainable development is ***“development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs”***. This proposal has a positive impact on the host property as well as the wider street scene. It harmonises well with existing architectures as well as balancing not only the host dwelling but balancing the look of the street as a whole. The large open

plan spaces serve the needs of the now, but leave so much scope for rearrangement or improvement in the future or for future generations.

Planning Policy and Central Government Policy Advice

By virtue of Section 36(6) of the Planning & Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, the planning authority must determine the application in accordance with the statutory development plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The importance of the statutory development plan in the decision making process necessitates an examination of the relationship of the policies of the plan to one another and to available government guidance, principally through published policy guidance and circulars.

Central Government Policy Advice

It is considered that the following central government policy advice in the form of the NPPF is relevant to the consideration of this proposal:-

The National Planning Policy Framework

In the Ministerial Forward of the original version of the NPPF it states:-

"The purpose of planning is to help achieve sustainable development."

The Minister goes on to state:-

"Development that is sustainable should go ahead without delay – a presumption in favour of sustainable development that is the basis for every plan, and every decision."

Paragraph 7 states

"The purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development. At a very high level, the objective of sustainable development can be summarised as meeting the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs"

Paragraph 8 of the Framework goes on to state that there are three dimensions to sustainable development: economic, social and environmental

Paragraph 10 goes on to state:-

"So that sustainable development is pursued in a positive way, at the heart of the Framework is a presumption in favour of sustainable development"

It is considered that this proposal constitutes sustainable development in a sustainable location.

Section 12 relates to requiring good design. At para 124 it states:-

"The creation of high quality buildings and places is fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve. 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."

The submitted design corresponds and reflects the context of its setting

With regard to determining applications, at Para 197 it states:-

"In determining applications, local planning authorities should take account of:

- a) the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and putting them to viable uses consistent with their conservation;***
- b) the positive contribution that conservation of heritage assets can make to sustainable communities including their economic vitality; and***
- c) the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness."***

It is considered that the subject proposal, which clearly constitutes sustainable development, is entitled to the presumption inherent in the advice and should be approved without delay.

Local Planning Policy

The Development Plan for Barnsley MBC consists of the Adopted Local Plan (January 2019) and accompanying Supplementary Planning Document, which superseded the Core Strategy (September 2011) and the Saved Unitary Development Plan Policies (September 2011). It should be noted that these documents predate the current national planning policy guidance (the NPPF(2021)).

The following policies are considered relevant to the proposal:

D1 – High Quality Design and Placemaking

The general design of the proposed development meets the requirements of this policy.

CC 1 – Climate Change

The proposed, relatively minor, build shouldn't have any particular impact on climate change.

CC 2 – Sustainable Design and Construction

The proposal is located in a sustainable location and will be constructed to the latest building regulations thermal requirements

CC3- Flood Risk

The site is located wholly within Flood Zone 1 and in line with the requirements of this policy an EA report for planning is submitted.

CC4 – Sustainable Drainage Systems

The matter of SUDS applies to major developments and is not applicable to this minor application.

Conclusion

The subject site forms a brownfield site located within an established residential area.

The proposals constitute a minor development in a sustainable location with easy access to Barnsley Town Centre.

We think the application is submitted with sufficient supporting documentation to allow the council to fully consider the application.

The documents show that this proposal is suitable for this location and we ask for as swift a possible response or decision so we might better get the ball rolling to get Janet moved in as soon as possible.

If you have any questions or concerns with the application, please contact us as soon as possible. If we can make this process any easier for you we will.

Many Kind Regards,

John & Sophie Upson