

Application Reference: 2025/0203

Site Address: 25 Hollin Moor View, Thurgoland, Barnsley, S36 7EE

Introduction:

This application seeks full planning permission for the erection of a single storey front and rear extensions to dwelling, located at 25 Hollin Moor View, Thurgoland, Barnsley, S36 7EE.

Relevant Site Characteristics

The site is located within a cul-de-sac in the north of Thurgoland village. The dwelling is a detached dwelling with a large rear garden. The surrounding area is predominantly residential in character with the dwellings being a mix of detached, semi-detached and terraced dwellings. There are a small number of commercial properties located south of the site, on Roper Lane and the A629, Such as the Green Dragon pub, Thurgoland Surgery and the Thurgoland bowling green.

Site History

No recent or relevant site history.

Detailed description of Proposed Works

The applicant has proposed single storey front and rear extensions to the dwelling. The front extension would extend the house to the existing porch building line and would have a sloped roof. The rear extension would have a flat roof and would construct a larger wall to the left elevation for the side of the extension. The proposal would measure approximately:

- Front extension – 3.1m (W) x 1.5m (L) x 3.3m (Height)
- Rear Extension – 4.6m (W) x 2.7m (L) x 2.5m (Height to Eaves) x 2.8m (Height to Roofline).
- Rear extension side wall – 0.3m (W) x 2.6(L) x 3m (H)

The applicant has stated that the materials used would match the existing dwelling house, however the rear extension would be constructed of reclaimed brick and matching stone to the side boundary.

Relevant policies

The Development Plan

Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires proposals to be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The development plan for Barnsley consists of the Barnsley Local Plan (adopted January 2019).

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

The following Local Plan policies are relevant in this case:

- Policy SD1: Presumption in favour of Sustainable Development.
- Policy D1: High Quality Design and Place Making.
- Policy GD1: General Development.

- Policy T4: New Development and Transport Safety

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and the National Planning Practice Guidance

In December 2024, The Government published a revised National Planning Policy Framework ("NPPF") which is the most recent revision of the original Framework, published first in 2012 and updated a number of times, providing the overarching planning framework for England. It sets out the Government's planning policies for England and how they are expected to be applied. The NPPF must be taken into account in the preparation of local and neighbourhood plans and is a material consideration in planning decisions. This revised document has replaced the earlier planning policy statements, planning policy guidance and various policy letters and circulars, which are now cancelled.

Central to the NPPF is a presumption in favour of sustainable development which is at the heart of the framework (paragraph 10) and plans and decisions should apply this presumption in favour of sustainable development (paragraph 11). The NPPF confirms that there are three dimensions to sustainable development: economic, social and environmental; each of these aspects are mutually dependent. The most relevant sections are:

Section 2 - Achieving sustainable development

Section 4 - Decision making

Section 12 - Achieving well-designed places

The National Design Guidance (2019) is a material consideration and sets out ten characteristics of well-designed places based on planning policy expectations. A written ministerial statement states that local planning authorities should take it into account when taking decisions.

Supplementary Planning Guidance

In line with the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012, Barnsley has adopted twenty-eight Supplementary Planning Documents (SPDs) following the adoption of the Local Plan in January 2019. The most pertinent SPD's in this case are:

- House extensions and other domestic alterations
- Parking
- Trees and Hedgerows

The adopted SPDs should be treated as material considerations in decision making and are afforded full weight.

Consultations

The application has been advertised in accordance with Article 15 of the Town and Country Planning Development Management Procedure (England) Order 2015.

Any neighbour sharing a boundary with the site has been sent written notification and the application has been advertised on the Council website.

2 letters from the same neighbour have been received in objection to the scheme stating the following issues:

- Loss of light
- Detrimental to amenity space
- High wind issues

- Flat roof to the rear is incongruous
- Incursion or encroachment on any part of our property by the applicant or anyone acting on his behalf in the pursuance of construction work and this includes projecting scaffolding.
- Inaccuracy with application form
- Height of the rear elevation is too large and proximity to boundary is too close.

These issues have been discussed in the main body of the report and the “other issues” section of the report.

Thurgoland Parish Council - No objections.

Planning Assessment

For the purposes of considering the balance in this application, the following planning weight is referred to in this report using the following scale:

- Substantial
- Considerable
- Significant
- Moderate
- Modest
- Limited
- Little or no

Principle

The site falls within the urban fabric of Barnsley. 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.

Scale, Design and Impact on the Character

There are examples of this kind of development nearby at other residential properties which have expanded the residential space to the front and rear. The extension to the front would extend to the building line of the porch, however not as far as the garage. The front extension would have a sloped roof to integrate with the existing porch and would use matching materials.

The rear extension would have a flat roof and would provide additional space for the kitchen/dining area. It should be noted that the rear extension would be acceptable in regard to permitted development in terms of its size, however as the applicant is using a mix of reclaimed brick and stone (side elevation). The stone wall would be seen to the side of the property and would hide the reclaimed brick design to the rear and as such would not be seen by the general public. As such it would not have a detrimental impact on the character of the area. The design and scale would therefore be acceptable in this regard.

As a result of the comments above, the impact on the visual amenity of the dwelling and the street scene as a whole would be maintained, in accordance with Local Plan Policy D1 and the requirements of SPD ‘House Extensions and Alterations (2024).

Impact on Neighbouring Amenity

The proposed extension would not a significant negative impact on neighbouring amenity. The extensions would be to the front and rear of the property, would be single storey and as such the scheme would not overlook any neighbours. The rear extension would be compliant

with permitted development rights apart from the use of reclaimed brick which will be used. Currently the scheme would not comply with the 45- degree code and as such could have a detrimental impact on neighbouring amenity. However, there are mitigating circumstances, such as the original dwelling and how it is plotted already breaks the 45-degree code and that the scheme would comply with permitted development apart from the materials. The neighbouring rear window situated on the rear of garage of 27 Hollin Moor View appears to be a secondary window. Therefore, even if this application was refused the applicant would be able to construct the rear extension under permitted development rights providing that the all the materials were matching.

The development would not change the orientation and building line of the property as the garage still protrudes further than the proposed development. Therefore, there is to be little to no detrimental impact on amenity to any neighbouring properties. Both the development and the neighbouring property would have blank side elevations (no windows) and as such would not lead to any loss of privacy or light. The applicant has proposed a wall to the east elevation of the rear extension which would be taller than the roofline of the rest of the extension. This wall would be blank to ensure that no loss of privacy takes place but would not be significantly large to be overdominating or cause any significant loss of light

Therefore, as a result of the comments above, the impact on the neighbouring amenity of the dwelling and the street scene as a whole would be maintained, in accordance with Local Plan Policy D1 and the requirements of SPD 'House Extensions and Alterations (2024).

Highways

The proposed rear extension would not result in the reduction in length of the driveway and the loss of access. The Council's highways Officer has not been consulted upon as there is not going to be any changes or impacts on highway safety. As such the proposal would be acceptable from a highway's perspective.

Other issues

A neighbour has raised the following concerns with the development, and as such the LPA will respond to these concerns, see below:

Loss of light and detrimental to amenity space – As explained earlier in the report, whilst it is accepted that there could be some impact on residential amenity, the scheme would still be viable to do under permitted development rights. It is only due to the plot positioning that there is this issue. As such if a refusal was given the applicant could still build to the dimensions illustrated, providing the materials matched.

High wind issues – Whilst this would be a concern for large developments, such as high rises, this is not a considerable concern which would impact on a householder application.

Flat roof to the rear is incongruous – Whilst it is accepted that the LPA does not support flat roofs as they are not in keeping with the character of the area. The flat roof extension would be situated at the rear of the property where it cannot be seen from the street. As such it would not have a detrimental impact on the street scene. It should also be noted that there are similar rear extensions in the area which also have flat roofs.

Incursion or encroachment on any part of our property by the applicant or anyone acting on his behalf in the pursuance of construction work and this includes projecting scaffolding – An informative will be attached

Inaccuracy with application form – The comments received from the neighbour state that the application form was filled out inaccurately as there are hedges on other properties which

border the site. However, these hedges are neither on the applicants land, protected by a TPO or are environmentally significant.

Height of the rear elevation is too large and proximity to boundary is too close – The neighbour has claimed that the rear extension would be too close to the boundary and too large. They claim that the scheme would be 3.2m, after using the Council's measuring tools it has been concluded that the height of the rear elevation wall would be 3m, as explained in the report previously. As such this would comply with the permitted development requirements and even if a refusal was given the applicant would still be able to construct the proposal without planning permission, providing all of the materials matched.

Planning Balance and Conclusion

For the reasons given above, and taking all other matters into consideration, the proposal complies with the relevant plan policies and planning permission should be granted subject to necessary conditions. Under the provisions of the NPPF, the application is considered to be a sustainable form of development and is therefore recommended for approval subject to conditions.

RECOMMENDATION: Approve subject to conditions

Justification

STATEMENT OF COMPLIANCE WITH ARTICLE 35 OF THE TOWN AND COUNTRY DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT PROCEDURE ORDER 2015

It has not been necessary to make contact with the applicant to request amendments to the proposal during the consideration of the application, as it was deemed acceptable.

Due regard has been given to Article 8 and Protocol 1 of Article 1 of the European Convention for Human Rights Act 1998 when considering objections, the determination of the application and the resulting recommendation. it is considered that the recommendation will not interfere with the applicant's and/or any objector's right to respect for his private and family life, his home and his correspondence.