

Planning application for the erection of a garage/summerhouse at 7 Shaw Lane, Staincross – (revision to planning permission ref. 2007/0517, approved 17.5.07)

The Site/ Surroundings

The application site is a detached house set within a large garden plot extending to approx 0.19 hectares.

The site is adjoined to all boundaries by residential properties; the site is within the existing settlement.

The Proposal

Planning permission is sought for revisions to the design of the outbuilding approved last year. The previous approval was for a double garage of 6.4 x 7.0 metres, with an attached swimming pool/gymnasium of 20.0 x 6.5 metres, sited in the rear garden adjacent to the sites eastern boundary.

Constraints imposed by the Environment Agency lead the applicant to reconsider the swimming pool, and resulted in a revised/ reduced size building being erected – the revised garage is 6.05 x 6.33 m. and the reduced summerhouse with Jacuzzi/gymnasium is 15.96 x 6.07 m.

The design of the summerhouse was revised to include a gabled roof, rather than a hipped end at the northern end of the building, and roof lights are intended to be provided to light the single aspect building (the roof lights have not been fitted, and could, if required, be omitted)

Site History

- 89/6949/DT - Building regulations approval for outbuilding (workshop/store), approved 2.11.89
- Planning permission for double garage attached to south side of above outbuilding, approved 8.3.05
- 2007/0517 – Detached swimming pool and double garage (on site of outbuilding and previously approved garage), approved 17.5.07
- 2007/23471/BR – Building regulations approval for swimming pool/garage, approved 23.8.07

Planning Policy

Under Section 38 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, decisions on planning applications 'must be made in accordance with the development plan unless other material considerations indicate otherwise'.

PRE PLANNING

Planning and Development

5 The Oakes, Wakefield WF1 4FD Tel: 07811226355 (mobile)

Email: preplanning@btinternet.com

The site is currently allocated as a Housing Policy Area on the approved Barnsley M.B.C Unitary Development Plan (UDP).

Policy H8E of the UDP relates specifically to proposals for house extensions and states –

Proposals for the extension of dwellings should

- a) be of a scale and design which harmonises with the existing building
- b) not adversely affect the amenity of neighbouring properties
- c) maintain the character of the streetscene
- d) not interfere with highway safety

The Council has produced supplementary planning guidance on house extensions (SPG4) to advise applicants of the principle issues, and to assist in the speedy determination of applications.

Evaluation

As indicated above, permissions have previously been approved for a detached store/workshop, for the addition of a detached garage to the south side of that building, and subsequently for a replacement building including a double garage and swimming pool on the site of the previously approved buildings. The building erected, which is a 17 % reduction in its length, (from 26.4m to 22.0m), was erected earlier this year, and is now substantially completed.

Council officers contacted the applicant recently to say that there were some irregularities in the design of the building, and that a revised application should be submitted to regularise the development.

The Council will obviously have considered the earlier application, for the larger swimming pool and garage, against the UDP policy H8E, and against the advice included in SPG4, the Council clearly felt that the approved development was in accord with policy, and approved that application.

This application is for a significant reduction in the size of the building, it is of reduced scale, and its design is not substantially different from that approved;

The building has no greater impact on the amenity of adjoining dwellings than did the previously approved scheme. The application includes rooflights at the apex of the roof to provide light into the central and rear areas of the single aspect building – the roof lights will not overlook adjoining properties to result in any loss of privacy. Conifer hedging is maintained to the site boundary.

The building has no greater impact on the streetscene being concealed from public view at the rear of the existing dwelling;

The proposal has no greater impact on road safety, the proposal utilises the existing access as did the previous approved scheme.

The building is in accord with the requirements of POLICY H8E.

The Council's SPG4 recognises that planning permission is not always required for building works within a domestic curtilage. In this case an ancillary outbuilding of the size and position erected, but with a slightly reduced roof pitch, could have been erected without requiring planning permission. The applicant however was keen that the outbuilding should be built with matching materials to the principal building, and the roof pitched to the same angle as the house to respect the character and appearance of the existing building.

We consider that the application is in accord with the development plan and in the absence of any demonstrable harm, suggest that planning permission should be approved for the retention of the building.

Yours faithfully

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'P Fletcher', is written over a faint horizontal line.

P Fletcher

Planning application for the erection of a garage/summerhouse at 7 Shaw Lane, Staincross – (revision to planning permission ref. 2007/0517, approved 17.5.07)

The Site/ Surroundings

The application site is a detached house set within a large garden plot extending to approx 0.19 hectares.

The site is adjoined to all boundaries by residential properties; the site is within the existing settlement.

The Proposal

Planning permission is sought for revisions to the design of the outbuilding approved last year. The previous approval was for a double garage of 6.4 x 7.0 metres, with an attached swimming pool/gymnasium of 20.0 x 6.5 metres, sited in the rear garden adjacent to the sites eastern boundary.

Constraints imposed by the Environment Agency lead the applicant to reconsider the swimming pool, and resulted in a revised/ reduced size building being erected – the revised garage is 6.05 x 6.33 m. and the reduced summerhouse with Jacuzzi/gymnasium is 15.96 x 6.07 m.

The design of the summerhouse was revised to include a gabled roof, rather than a hipped end at the northern end of the building, and roof lights are intended to be provided to light the single aspect building (the roof lights have not been fitted, and could, if required, be omitted)

Site History

- 89/6949/DT - Building regulations approval for outbuilding (workshop/store), approved 2.11.89
- Planning permission for double garage attached to south side of above outbuilding, approved 8.3.05
- 2007/0517 – Detached swimming pool and double garage (on site of outbuilding and previously approved garage), approved 17.5.07
- 2007/23471/BR – Building regulations approval for swimming pool/garage, approved 23.8.07

Planning Policy

Under Section 38 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, decisions on planning applications 'must be made in accordance with the development plan unless other material considerations indicate otherwise'.

PRE PLANNING

Planning and Development

5 The Oakes, Wakefield WF1 4FD Tel: 07811226355 (mobile)

Email: preplanning@btinternet.com

The site is currently allocated as a Housing Policy Area on the approved Barnsley M.B.C Unitary Development Plan (UDP).

Policy H8E of the UDP relates specifically to proposals for house extensions and states –

Proposals for the extension of dwellings should

- a) be of a scale and design which harmonises with the existing building
- b) not adversely affect the amenity of neighbouring properties
- c) maintain the character of the streetscene
- d) not interfere with highway safety

The Council has produced supplementary planning guidance on house extensions (SPG4) to advise applicants of the principle issues, and to assist in the speedy determination of applications.

Evaluation

As indicated above, permissions have previously been approved for a detached store/workshop, for the addition of a detached garage to the south side of that building, and subsequently for a replacement building including a double garage and swimming pool on the site of the previously approved buildings. The building erected, which is a 17 % reduction in its length, (from 26.4m to 22.0m), was erected earlier this year, and is now substantially completed.

Council officers contacted the applicant recently to say that there were some irregularities in the design of the building, and that a revised application should be submitted to regularise the development.

The Council will obviously have considered the earlier application, for the larger swimming pool and garage, against the UDP policy H8E, and against the advice included in SPG4, the Council clearly felt that the approved development was in accord with policy, and approved that application.

This application is for a significant reduction in the size of the building, it is of reduced scale, and its design is not substantially different from that approved;

The building has no greater impact on the amenity of adjoining dwellings than did the previously approved scheme. The application includes rooflights at the apex of the roof to provide light into the central and rear areas of the single aspect building – the roof lights will not overlook adjoining properties to result in any loss of privacy. Conifer hedging is maintained to the site boundary.

The building has no greater impact on the streetscene being concealed from public view at the rear of the existing dwelling;

The proposal has no greater impact on road safety, the proposal utilises the existing access as did the previous approved scheme.

The building is in accord with the requirements of POLICY H8E.

The Council's SPG4 recognises that planning permission is not always required for building works within a domestic curtilage. In this case an ancillary outbuilding of the size and position erected, but with a slightly reduced roof pitch, could have been erected without requiring planning permission. The applicant however was keen that the outbuilding should be built with matching materials to the principal building, and the roof pitched to the same angle as the house to respect the character and appearance of the existing building.

We consider that the application is in accord with the development plan and in the absence of any demonstrable harm, suggest that planning permission should be approved for the retention of the building.

Yours faithfully

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'P Fletcher', written in a cursive style.

P Fletcher
