

Application Reference: 2025/0052**Site Address:** 47 Plumpton Park, Shafton, Barnsley, S72 8WF**Introduction:**

This application seeks full planning permission for a 2 storey side extension to 2 storey terraced dwelling

Relevant Site Characteristics

Located in modern housing development which leads south westerly from the principal throughfare of High Street in the Village of Shafton; the dwelling is a two-story end terrace, part of contemporary styled triple dwelling terrace block which appears from the front elevation as an unsymmetrical pair of pair of semi-detached houses. The two-bedroomed house is constructed of mixed red brick and features a grey tiled gable roof. The front garden is open plan with hardstanding for parking provision, which also extends along the side elevation of the dwelling and is bordered by an approximate 0.6m retaining boundary wall with additional medium sized wooden panel fence on top. The rear garden features a white UPVC style conservatory, a small patio area and a lawn. The rear boundary treatment borders the rear garden of a single bungalow on Bleak Avenue, and at a further distance, overlooks two additional gardens on Bleak Avenue. The adjacent unattached neighbour of No.49 Plumpton Park is essentially a 2.5 storey semi-detached dwelling, set at a slightly lower ground level, but maintaining a higher ridge height featuring accommodation within the dormered roof space.

Site History

Since construction, there is no recorded site history for this address.

Detailed description of Proposed Works

A two-storey side extension constructed of matching materials and with a roof design matching the original dwelling is proposed. Internally the ground floor would feature a garage style storage area, including the introduction of garage door on the front elevation, with a separate playroom located behind. The first story would include the provision of two bedrooms, which meet minimum space standards for single rooms, and a small landing extension. In addition to the ground floor garage door, bedroom windows are proposed on the front and rear elevations but no side windows are proposed.

The extension would feature a side projection of approximately 2.69m, infilling the existing space between the side elevation and the boundary with No.49. The length of the extension on both the ground and first floor would be approximately 8.11m, which would be 0.4m less than the original side elevation measurement of 8.5m. The Eaves height would stand at

approximately 5m, matching the existing eaves height whilst the roof height would be stepped down by 0.10m at approximately 7.65m compared to the original roof height of 7.75m.

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

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.

Four objections from three unique neighbours have been made, with one neighbour making two separate objections. The following bullet points summarise the objections.

- Three objections mention the potential impact of loss of light, particularly sunlight
- Two objections mention the potential for the creation of a 'terracing' effect due to the location of the proposal next to unattached neighbouring dwelling at No.47.
- Two objectors raise concern over impact on the use of their rear gardens, and one also mentions impact on their side garden.
- One objection mentions the potential for increased on street parking on what they describe as an 'overcrowded cul-de-sac' regarding parking provision.

Shafton Parish Council – The parish council was consulted but no comments or objections were received.

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 Urban Fabric. 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

The scale of the proposal would be acceptable as it is not of an excessive size and broadly complies with the requirements outlined in the SPD House Extensions and Other Domestic Extensions. Specifically, at approximately 2.69m the extension is less than two thirds of the width of the original dwelling's approximate 4.25m width. The eaves height of the extension matches the eaves height of the original dwelling and the roof height is stepped down by 0.10m. Whilst there is no definitive size requirement required for the step down of the roof, this is one aspect of the proposal which may be considered as the minimal indication of subordination to the host dwelling. Upon querying this limited setback, it was required to maintain a matching style of roof to the existing dwelling. One further discrepancy where the proposal does not strictly comply is the requirement of a minimum setback of 500mm (0.5m) on at least the first-floor front elevation of a side extension. As the proposal has instead provided a 0.4m set back on both the ground and first floor, on this occasion the disparity with policy requirements may be considered acceptable, especially as it has no negative impact parking provision or neighbouring amenity. The scale of the proposal would be considered to have a modest impact.

The proposal is designed to use matching materials and would feature a matching style roof, so the principle of the design would be acceptable. However, whilst the proposal does show subordination to the original dwelling, as mentioned above in relation to scale, the step down of the roof and a reduced size of set back in relation to policy guidance has to be considered in relation to the design of the extension and its impact upon the character of the host dwelling and broader street scene. With the terrace block of three dwellings already appearing as an unsymmetrical pair of semi-detached houses, the proposal would add some balance to the appearance of the block but without a gable roof or bay window, would not exactly match the opposite end terraced house. However, even with the reduced setback and step down, the extension would reduce the imbalance of the block whilst showing subordination to the host dwelling and overall block. It would therefore be deemed that the design would have a limited impact on the character of the dwelling or dwelling block.

Taking consideration of the proposal in the context of scale, design and impact on character beyond the dwelling and terraced block, potential valid concerns have been raised in objections about the proposal regarding the potential terracing effect. Of course what has to be noted is that the dwelling is itself part of a terraced block of three dwellings, but as mentioned with one

end terrace featuring a side entrance door, the block looks more akin to a pair of semi-detached houses. In contrast to the application dwelling, the unattached neighbouring dwelling of No.49 is an actual semi-detached house and this identity must remain, hence the avoidance of creating a terracing effect between unattached dwellings. Local policy guidance states where practical a 1m gap should be maintained between side extensions and the boundary treatment. On this occasion with a limited available width between the dwelling and the boundary, any gap between the extension and boundary would be impractical and prevent the first floor bedrooms from meeting the required space standards. Despite no gap being included between the extension and the boundary, the adjacent unattached neighbour has in essence a walkway between the side elevation of their dwelling and the boundary of approximately 1.19m. In conjunction with the proposed set back of the extension, and the differing heights of the applicant's property with that of No. 49, the proposal would prevent the terracing effect of the two dwellings. With an acceptable separation distance maintained and in conjunction with other scale and design factors mentioned above, it would be considered that the proposal would have a modest impact on the scale, design and character of the street scene

Impact on Neighbouring Amenity

The most significant objection from neighbouring dwellings was the impact of reduced light levels, particularly sun light levels. With the location of the extension, there would of course be no impact on light levels in regard to the attached neighbouring dwellings within the terrace block or those neighbours on the opposite side of the road. The adjacent neighbour of No.49 does have a small first floor side window and rooflights on the rear roof plane. Undoubtedly there would be some impact on the light levels into their side elevation bathroom window, but this is considered as a non-habitable room, and with an approximate 1.19m gap maintained between the dwellings, light would still reach the bathroom window. As the extension does not extend beyond the rear elevation of the dwelling, and with the neighbouring roof at a higher level, there would be no impact on light or outlook from the rooflights. Potentially there may be an impact on light levels to the conservatory extension, side and rear gardens of the neighbouring dwelling but again due to the location of the proposal, the most significant impact would be on the small walkway from the front to rear gardens of the neighbouring dwelling. Having checked the sun path direction, the loss of sunlight would be minimal. For the attached neighbour, No. 51 and neighbours opposite the application dwelling, there would be little or no impact on their amenity. Specifically for the neighbouring dwelling of No.49, the impact on their amenity in relation to light would be considered as modest.

For the rear neighbouring dwelling of No.48 Bleak Avenue and dwellings beyond, the impact of light levels into their windows would not be affected and with a distance of approximately 14m between the proposed extension and the rear boundary, there would be minimum impact on light levels in their gardens. Whilst the gap between No.7 and No.49 would be significantly reduced, the volume of equal sized or higher dwellings on Plumpton Park would have an existing or greater impact on light levels. For No.48 Bleak Avenue and nearby dwellings, the impact of the proposal on light levels would be considered to be limited.

Two objections mention the impact on loss of enjoyment of their gardens due to the proposed extensions. Having excluded the impact of light levels being a significant concern, the next consideration would be that of overlooking. The proposal exceeds the minimum 10m distance between a two-storey extension and the rear boundary of the curtilage as outlined in local policy. In addition to the approximate 14m distance to the boundary, the proposed first floor window does not directly overlook any habitable room window of a neighbouring dwelling. Equally there is an approximate 21m distance between the proposed front elevation window and the windows of the dwelling opposite. It would therefore be considered that the proposal would have little or no impact on the neighbouring amenity.

The final objection was in relation to potential increase in on street parking. As long as the required amount of parking provision is maintained or created within the curtilage of the dwelling, which in this instance would require a minimum of two parking spaces, the external impact of inconsiderate parking outside of the application site is not a material planning consideration. The impact on neighbour amenity would be considered to have little or no impact.

Highways

As there is an increase in bedroom numbers from two to four bedrooms, there is a requirement for at least two parking spaces to be provided within the curtilage. On a site visit to the address, I noticed that there appeared to be sufficient parking provision within the predominantly hard surfaced area of the front garden. Additionally two spaces were shown on the proposed plans, and the extension would not affect this provision. With required off street parking provided and no proposed changes to access to the site, there would be no detrimental impact caused by the proposal in regard to parking provision or highway safety. It is therefore considered that there would be limited impact.

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.

RECOMMENDATION: Approve subject to conditions

Justification

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

It has been necessary to make contact with the applicant to request clarification of parking provision sizing but apart from additional annotations to the proposal during the consideration

of the application, there has been no other amendments to the submitted plans which were 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.