

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

Planning Application comments have been made. A summary of the comments is provided below.

Comments were submitted at 31/05/2025 4:00 PM from Miss Amanda Griffiths.

Application Summary

Address: 10 Highfield Crescent Barlby North Yorkshire YO8 5HD

Proposal: House extension notification for a single storey rear extension extending 4.7 metres to rear, 3.5 metres to ridge and 2.25 metres to eaves

Case Officer: Esther Pask

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Name: Miss Amanda Griffiths

Email: [REDACTED]

Address: 11 Highfield Crescent, Barlby, North Yorkshire YO8 5HD

Comments Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Reasons for comment: - Residential Amenity

Comments: In determining the application for a large single storey extension to the rear of 10 Highfield Crescent, Barlby, Selby, YO8 5HD, and in the absence of an up to date local plan for Selby, which is currently being revised we make the following comments about impact to the residential amenity of immediate neighbouring residents, relying on the National Planning Policy Framework (2024). Whilst there is a presumption in favour of permitted development, we believe the prejudicial impact to residential amenity of immediate adjoining neighbours demonstrably outweighs the benefits of approving the proposal based on the following:

1. Non-Compliance with Consultation Procedures; The neighbour consultation does not comply with correct consultation procedure. The proposed development will directly impact the amenity of the adjoining mid-terrace property which is a local authority owned home. Neighbour consultation served notice to the tenant only and not the local authority landlord despite the direct impact to the amenity of the immediate adjoining mid-terrace dwelling, and the intention to carry out unauthorised works to local authority owned property. Therefore the consultation failed to include all immediate neighbours with an interest in the proposed development.

2. Layout and Density of Buildings: The proposal does not adequately consider the layout and proportions of adjoining properties. Highfield Crescent, Barlby is a large cul-de-sac consisting of 38 well-spaced semi-detached dwellings and 4 closely situated mid-terraced dwellings. The properties are characterised by large gardens to both the front and rear. There are 2 rows of identical terraced dwellings, one on each side of the cul-de-sac. These are set out in rows of 4 dwellings, consisting of 2 semi-detached properties at each end with 2 adjoining mid-terraced dwellings to the centre. 10 Highfield Crescent is a mid-terrace property connecting with the adjoining mid-terrace dwelling on the first floor to the side of a ground level walkway enclosed by bedrooms to the front and rear elevations of the adjoining mid-terrace dwelling.

While many of the residents in Highfield Crescent have maximised use of existing adjoining outbuildings to increase the living space of their homes, to date rear extensions have only been added to a few of the semi-detached dwellings. Those dwellings have east and west facing aspects in addition to either north or south facing gable ends with private access to the rear gardens. The striking difference to the layout of the mid-terrace dwellings means that any extension, especially one of this scale in the context of a more densely situated plot with limited shared access will have a more significant adverse impact upon the residential amenity to the

immediate neighbouring property and its residents.

3. **Scale and Dominance:** The application does not consider the existing form, scale and layout of the mid-terrace dwellings. The proposal indicates that the extension would be sited in close proximity to the boundary wall with the adjoining mid-terrace property, which would significantly alter the appearance and character of the mid-terrace dwellings. The appearance and spacing between these closely situated properties is of vital importance to the residential amenity of immediate neighbouring residents. An overbearingly large extension of this scale would have a demonstrably harmful effect as the rear elevation of the adjoining mid-terrace property would be crammed in and completely dominated by large scale blank walls of extensions to the rear of both adjoining dwellings, in addition to the existing detached outbuildings. Paragraph 124 of the NPPF states that 'Planning policies and decisions should safeguard and improve the environment, ensuring safe and healthy living conditions', but this proposal will result in immediate neighbouring residents being overbearingly enclosed and completely hemmed in to the north and south.

4. **Loss of Daylight, Sunlight and Overshadowing:** Sunlight and daylight are valued elements of a good quality living environment. However a large extension of this scale sited directly south of the adjoining mid-terrace property will significantly overshadow the rear west facing aspect of the immediate neighbouring dwelling, reducing the amount of daylight and sunlight to the main living areas (kitchen, living room and rear garden). This will severely impact the amenity of immediate neighbouring residents to an unacceptable level.

Both mid-terrace dwellings have an east facing aspect to the front elevation, with a west facing aspect to the rear elevations. This means that both properties only receive direct sunlight to the front and rear elevations at certain times of day, with a greater reduction of daylight and sunlight in winter months. The proposal fails to consider potentially significant loss of daylight and sunlight to the main living areas of the immediate adjoining mid-terrace property north of the applicants boundary where shadow-fall is greatest. This is in addition to the shadow-fall cast by the extension to the rear of 12 Highfield Crescent, north of the living room window of the adjoining mid-terrace dwelling at 11 Highfield Crescent.

Whilst there has been no shadow-fall analysis to determine the likely extent of overshadowing, the shadow-fall of any extension to the south of the adjoining mid-terrace property, especially one of this scale would significantly impact the energy efficiency for the immediate neighbouring home. This will create a significant

increase in the need for artificial lighting and heating to the adjoining mid-terrace property. Conversely the impact of additional thermal load from the extension in the summer months will result in an inability to properly cool or ventilate the adjoining mid-terrace property. Notably the NPPF sets out interdependent economic, social and environmental objectives. The proposed extension will create environmental and economic conditions that are in direct opposition to the NPPF aims for both present and future generations of the adjoining mid-terrace property.

5. Visual amenity: It is recognised that visual amenity of a living space contributes to well-being and mental health. The visual impact and overall appearance and design of the proposed extension means the residential visual amenity of the adjoining mid-terrace property would be physically dominated by large overbearing brick walls. The loss of visual amenity will result in the outlook being extremely oppressive for immediate neighbouring residents of the adjoining mid-terrace, which is not conducive to well-being and mental health. Being completely hemmed in by blank brick walls from both immediate adjoining neighbouring properties will be overwhelmingly unbearable, and would be truly depressing, completely ruining the visual amenity that immediate neighbouring residents of the adjoining mid-terraced property have enjoyed for over 26 years.

6. Disabled Person's Access: The means of access to any residential property should be both safe and convenient. Access to the rear of 10 Highfield Crescent is through a narrow enclosed walkway which is shared with the adjoining mid-terraced property, limiting access to the rear of both dwellings. Construction of the proposed extension would be extremely disruptive, causing substantial interference for immediate neighbouring residents by severely impeding safe access to the adjoining mid-terraced dwelling, which is a local authority owned home that provides for someone with a disability. The NPPF stresses the importance of social inclusion and under the Equality Act 2010 public bodies have a duty to actively promote equality and reduce disadvantage to ensure fair treatment for all. This is of particular relevance as the immediate neighbouring residents have protected characteristics. While paragraph 135 of the NPPF states that 'Planning policies and decisions should ensure that developments create places that are safe, inclusive and accessible with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users' the proposal does not provide for immediate neighbouring residents previously uninterrupted safe access to their home of 26 years.

7. Local Climatic Conditions: The application does not consider local climatic conditions since the enclosed nature of the shared pathway that runs beneath the front and rear bedrooms of the adjoining mid-terrace property creates a wind funnel.

To site any extension, especially one of this scale in close proximity to the tunnelled access will exacerbate climatic problems by intensifying wind flow between the proposed north facing aspect of the proposed extension and the neighbouring outbuildings of the adjoining mid-terraced property. Intensified wind funnelling through constricted spaces of this nature would render access to the rear of both mid-terraced properties unsafe. This would also severely impede to the rear of the adjoining mid-terrace property for anyone with a disability, which would be discriminatory under the Equality Act 2010.

8. Drainage problems: The scale of the proposal means that there will be a significant reduction in natural drainage to the rear elevation of the applicant property. The concentration of concrete around the proposed extension will exacerbate existing problems with poor drainage between the adjoining mid-terrace properties which causes rainwater to drain towards the neighbouring mid-terrace dwelling. This has caused a large fissure in the concrete path of the neighbouring property, resulting in paving subsiding culminating in trip hazards.

In conclusion we believe that the cumulative impact to immediate neighbouring residents would be so prejudicial that this proposal is unsuitable. The prejudicial impact to residential amenity, in addition to the scale of the proposed extension and proximity to the boundary would result in an over-dominant development out of keeping with the existing mid-terraced homes. As such the proposal would have an unacceptable detrimental impact resulting in significant harm to the residential amenity of immediate neighbouring residents home of over 26 years. Consequently we firmly believe that the application should not be accepted.

Kind regards