

2021/0804

Mr Mark Fitch

Alterations to dwelling consisting of first floor extensions on both sides and rear, front and rear facing dormer window extensions, altered roof configuration, single storey rear and front porch extensions and changes to the external facing materials

6 Vicarage Lane, Royston, Barnsley, S71 4QY

Site Description

The application relates to a detached 1.5 storey property located within a predominantly residential area. There is an enclosed garden area to the front of the property and a driveway from Vicarage Lane leading down the Western elevation of the property to the rear. On the Eastern elevation of the property is a single storey extension which was approved under application 04/1835. To the rear of the dwelling is an enclosed garden area and outbuildings within close proximity of the rear elevation of the building.

There are dormer bungalows adjacent to each side boundary and a detached dwelling, access from Church Street, to the rear. Opposite the site are the grounds associated with Parkside Primary School.



Proposed Development

The applicant seeks permission for alterations and extensions to the dwelling including first floor extensions on both sides and rear, front and rear facing dormer window extensions, altered roof configuration, single storey rear and front porch extensions and changes to the external facing materials.

Existing



Proposed



Existing



Proposed



Policy Context

The site is allocated as Urban Fabric within the Local Plan Proposals Maps and therefore the following Local Plan policies are relevant:

Policy GD1 General Development

Policy D1 High Quality Design and Place Making

Policy T4 'New Development & Transport Safety

Policy HE1 The Historic Environment'

Policy HE3 Development Effecting Historic Buildings

SPD's

Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) – 'House Extensions and other domestic alterations' sets out 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 for should:

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

These policies are considered to reflect policies set out in the revised NPPF, which requires development to be of high-quality design and provide a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings.

SPD 'Parking' – 1no. parking space required for dwellings with 2 bedrooms or less and 2no. spaces for dwellings with 3 bedrooms or more.

Consultee Responses

Conservation Officer - no objection in heritage terms. Questions over width of the proposal and general appropriateness of this for the size of plot.

Representations

One letter of support has been received stating the extensions would make a positive contribution to the area,

Assessment

Principle of Development

The site is allocated as Urban Fabric within the 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.

Visual Amenity

It is noted that there are differing property styles, ages, designs and styles within the immediate area, including detached and semi-detached 2 storey properties on the opposite side of Vicarage Lane. It is also recognized that the property itself differs from the neighbouring properties and has limited architectural merit. However, the application property sits between 2 detached dormer bungalows, as such, the extended property would need to harmonise with those properties in order to maintain the visual amenity of the streetscene and reflect the development pattern of the immediate area.

The proposed side extensions would project within 500mm of the side boundaries and provide accommodation over 2 floors. They would also incorporate gables within close proximity of the boundaries. Although the neighbouring properties also have gables there is some separation from the shared boundaries.

By the resultant dwelling occupying almost the full width of its plot, it would result in a frontage wider than the immediately neighbouring properties and the dominance of that frontage would

be compounded by the front projecting gable. The extension would result in an almost continuous run of 3 properties with little 'breathing' space between them which would be contrary to the immediate character of this section of Vicarage Lane. Furthermore, as the surrounding area is relatively undeveloped and green with school grounds directly opposite and immediately beyond number 10 to the East.

In addition, the host property, and the properties to either side, are 1.5 storey dwellings with modest rooms within the roof space and modest eaves heights. The proposed extensions would increase the eaves height to create a desiccated first floor rather than the rooms being within a roof. The host property has 2no. bedrooms and a modest landing in the roof at the moment but the resultant dwelling would have 4no. large bedrooms (1no. en-suite), a large family bathroom and a galleried landing.

The increase in the eaves height would be highly noticeable given the close proximity of the modest, single storey, eaves height of the immediately neighbouring properties. As such, the proposed significant extensions in this location would appear incongruous within the streetscene, to the detriment of visual amenity and contrary to local plan policies D1 and GD1.

Extensions should also be subordinate additions with the host property remaining the dominant visual feature, the proposed extensions would almost engulf the existing property with very little remaining of the host, contrary to the SPD.

Another point to note is that the front elevation of the property is largely symmetrical, however, the proposed porch is positioned off centre which, as a result, is very noticeable, especially, as it does not line up vertically with the window above, contrary to the SPD.

The proposal has 2 choices of materials, the first choice would be smooth render which would further emphasis the size and width of the dwelling as it would stand out in the streetscene which has little render evident. The second choice would be stone and brick similar to the existing dwelling.

As outlined above, the proposed side elevations of the extensions would be within 500mm of the shared boundaries. This limits pedestrian access to the rear of the property and also, given the wheel width of a standard wheelie bin is 573mm it would make it very difficult to keep bins and recycling containers to the rear of the property. Therefore, they are likely to be kept to the front of the property which would have a negative impact on the visual amenity of the area, contrary to Local Plan Policy D1.

Residential Amenity

The proposed extension on the Western elevation would be located within close proximity to the side elevation and side boundary of number 4 Vicarage Lane. The extension would have accommodation over 2 floors and would project beyond the neighbouring rear elevation. However, the neighbouring property does not have habitable room windows on the side elevation and the proposed extension would be positioned to the North East of the neighbouring rear elevation and private amenity space, as such, the proposal would not significantly increase overshadowing or be an overbearing feature.

The proposed extensions on the Eastern elevation would also be in close proximity to number 10, however, that property does not have habitable room windows on the side elevation and the proposed extensions would not project beyond the neighbouring front or rear elevations.

There are no habitable room windows proposed on the side elevations facing the shared boundaries and the proposed front and rear habitable room windows meet the required separation distance.

Heritage

The question from the heritage perspective is whether the proposal site contributes to the setting of the adjacent highly graded (II*) St John the Baptist and whether the proposal would harm this setting.

The site is part of a small development that appears to have been constructed sometime after 1960. Gransden House is approximately 25m to the south and has some clear and evident heritage significance being associated with the church. However, 6 Vicarage Lane is quite different being much later and has no functional relationship with the church or the church land. Moreover, the position of Gransden House means there is limited intervisibility from the proposal site to the church and the church yard which is approximately 100m to the south.

In heritage terms the Conservation Officer has little objection. The current dwelling and proposal site contribute little to grade II* church either historically, functionally or in terms of the related setting. Consequently, he advised the proposal is unlikely to cause harm. However, he did question how appropriate the scale of the proposed dwelling in terms of the impact on the neighbours and would also question if this plot can accommodate the width of the proposed dwelling and if shoe horning this in would harm neighbour amenity.

Highway Safety

The applicant also proposes to move the existing vehicular access point from the West of the site to the East. Currently there is space for off road parking for several vehicles to the front, side and rear of the dwelling. However, the proposed layout would include a driveway of circa 8m long and 3m wide which is only large enough to accommodate 1no. vehicle. There is an integral garage, but the length of 5.2m falls short of the required internal dimensions as out in the South Yorkshire Residential Design Guide to be considered a parking space. As such, there is only 1no. recognized in curtilage parking space proposed which is short of the 2no. required in SPD 'Parking'.

Conclusion

Taking into account the relevant development plan policies and other material considerations, given the width of the resultant dwelling, the increased eaves height and proximity of the extensions to the side boundaries, the proposals would appear incongruous within the streetscene, to the detriment of visual amenity and contrary to local plan policies D1 and GD1.

Furthermore, the scheme would only provide 1no. in curtilage parking space which falls short of the requirement set out in SPD 'Parking'.

As such the scheme is considered to conflict with policies and guidelines and is recommended for refusal.

Recommendation

Refuse – for the following reasons;

In the opinion of the Local Planning Authority the proposed extensions and alterations would be contrary to Policy D1 of the Local Plan and the Council's Supplementary Planning Document 'House Extensions and Other Domestic Alterations' in that their bulky design, excessive size, width and eaves height would be architecturally inconsistent with the character of the host property and immediately adjacent neighbouring properties and would as a consequence appear as a cramped and oversized incongruous feature in the street scene that would be harmful to the visual amenity of the locality.

The proposed development fails to provide sufficient and suitable car parking provision within the site, as recommended by SPD 'Parking'. Consequently, the proposal would be likely to

result in on-street car parking along Vicarage Lane to the detriment of the safe and free flow of traffic on the highway and contrary to Local Plan Policy T4.