

KIRKLEES METROPOLITAN COUNCIL

PLANNING SERVICE

UPDATE OF LIST OF PLANNING APPLICATIONS TO BE DECIDED BY

PLANNING SUB-COMMITTEE (HUDDERSFIELD AREA)

18 APRIL 2019

Planning Application 2018/91581

Item 13 – Page 27

**Erection of detached dwelling with access off Longwood Edge Road
rear of, 481, New Hey Road, Salendine Nook, Huddersfield, HD3 3XG**

Correction

Paragraph 4.3, outlining the relevant planning history of the area states;

rear of, 481, New Hey Road

2018/91581: Erection of detached bungalow – Conditional Full
Permission

The address and reference are incorrect, and are corrected to;

483, New Hey Road

2009/91952: Erection of detached bungalow – Conditional Full
Permission

Further Plans

An amended location plan has been received. It removes the blue line around no.481 New Hey Road, as this unit has been sold and therefore no longer falls within the applicant's ownership.

Another plan has been provided showing access sightlines, in response to local objection.

Public Representation

Due to amended plans being received throughout the process of the application, the application's third public representation period expired on the 12th of April, following the committee report being published on the 10th of April.

A further nine public representations have been received. The following is a summary of the further comments received.

- Highlighting safety concerns over the erection of a dwelling on a bend in the road. These are exacerbated by the idea of cars reversing into the road. Drivers travel at speed along Longwood Edge Road.
- The turning cannot facilitate three vehicles.
- Question over the location of visitor parking.
- The proposed turning area is not accurate and could not be achieved. This will result in the dwelling being pushed back.

Response: Being on the outside of the bend, officers consider the dwelling's access to have appropriate sightlines. This has been demonstrated on the plan showing the sightlines.

Regarding turning, it is accepted that because the parking is tandem internal coordination will be required by future residents. Nonetheless this is not unusual. Officers explored various layouts between the dwelling and parking, with that proposed being concluded to be acceptable.

Officers do not seek visitor parking for a single dwelling, with this to be accommodated on the local highway network similar to neighbouring dwellings.

- The design is not in keeping with the surrounding bungalows.
- The proposal is back-land development.

Response: It is accepted that the dwelling is not a bungalow, and that those fronting onto New Hey Road are. However, the newer dwellings along this section of Longwood Edge Road are 2-storey or have accommodation in the roof space.

- Concerns that the proposal requires the loss / repositioning of a telegraph pole. Local residents, many who are elderly, rely upon their phones. What assurances can be provided?

Response: The pole is part of Openreach's infrastructure (a part of BT). Their permission is required to legally move or alter telegraph poles, with their own internal process and procedures in place.

- The dwelling overlooks neighbouring dwellings.
- The proposal causes overshadowing upon no.481 New Hey Road.
- No.481 is left with too small of a garden

Response: A detailed assessment of residential amenity has been undertaken within paragraphs 10.11 – 10.21 of the principal report.

For the properties to the rear, they are in excess of 22.75m from the new dwelling's rear which is considered sufficient to prevent harmful overlooking (paragraph 10.12).

Specific to no.67 Longwood Edge Road, this is considered within paragraph 10.16 – 10.18. It is acknowledged that the proposed building is set back from no.67. However this is typical for dwellings fronting onto Longwood Edge Road. Given the separation distance and relative layouts of the dwellings officers concluded, on balance, that there would be no undue harm upon the amenity of no.67's occupiers.

In relation to no.481's garden, it is acknowledged to be small. On balance, given the circumstances of the application with particular weight given to the fact that the bungalow fell within the same ownership at the time the application was made and that this has been now purchased with the smaller garden it is clear the future occupier is aware of the dwelling's garden size, on balance officers do not object to the garden arrangement for no.481 (paragraph 10.13).

- The granting of permission in 2009 next door does not establish a principle for this site.

Response: This is noted and, while reference is given to it within the report, the application has been assessed on its own merits. Limited weight is given to the 2009 application; given that the grant of permission has since expired and that it was assessed under different planning policy.

- More street lighting and double yellows should be considered for Longwood Edge Road.

Response: Officers are satisfied that neither of these are required to make the development acceptable in planning terms. Therefore, to require them in association with this development, would be unreasonable.

- Question over the time of development and impacts such as dust and noise upon neighbouring residents.
- Concerns over construction traffic.

Response: A level of disruption during construction is inevitable; given the scale and nature of the proposal. An informative note can be imposed setting out good practice in terms of hours of construction. For a development of this scale it would not be reasonable to impose a construction management plan.

- Questioning why the committee report was published before the deadline and why it is dated the 18th of April, which suggests public comments are not taken into account and a decision has been made.

Response: The committee report is dated the 18th as that is the day of the intended committee. Within paragraph 7.2 of the report officers identify that the public representation period had not expired at the time of the report being published and any further representations would be reported within the update.

- Concerns that the proposal would be changed in the future and become even worse.

Response: Material alterations would be subject to subsequent applications and require review by officers. Should unauthorised works take place and the LPA notified, they would be investigated by planning enforcement.

- Question over waste sewerage arrangements.

Response: This would be addressed at building regulations stage for a development of this scale.

Planning Application 2018/94038

Item 14 – Page 43

Demolition of existing single storey rear extension and erection of two storey rear extension. Infill of side passage way to form part of dwelling and formation of new window to front elevation (Listed Building)

95, Church Street, Paddock, Huddersfield, HD1 4UB

Correction

Paragraph 10.19 should read *“Although the extension would create an additional bedroom, it is considered that this would **not** have a material impact on the demand for on-street parking space”*.

Representation

Two further representations have been received since the agenda was published. The following is a summary of the comments made;

- Two local residents / neighbours have reviewed the proposal and do not object, offering their support. The proposal would match with the surrounding environment.

Response: Comments in support are noted. Nonetheless, for the reasons outlined within the assessment undertaken in paragraph’s 10.6 – 10.16 of the committee report, and as summarised within the reason for refusal, officers maintain that the proposal would cause less than substantial harm to the significance of the listed building which is not outweighed by identified public benefits.

Listed Building Consent for demolition of existing single storey rear extension and erection of two storey rear extension. Infill of side passage way to form part of dwelling and formation of new window to front elevation

95, Church Street, Paddock, Huddersfield, HD1 4UB

Representation

Two further representations have been received since the agenda was published. The following is a summary of the comments made;

- Two local residents / neighbours have reviewed the proposal and do not object, offering their support. The proposal would match with the surrounding environment.

Response: Comments in support are noted. Nonetheless, for the reasons outlined within the assessment undertaken in paragraph's 10.6 – 10.16 of the committee report, and as summarised within the reason for refusal, officers maintain that the proposal would cause less than substantial harm to the significance of the listed building which is not outweighed by identified public benefits.

Erection of detached bungalow (farm workers dwelling)

Hollin Bank Farm, Cross Gate Road, Holmfirth, HD9 1SL

The applicant has requested the following information from the Group Secretary of the National Farmers Union be included in the update:

“I write to confirm that Mr Bruce Roberts has been a Full Farming Member of the National Farmers Union for at least the past 18 years (as far as our current records go back). For many years Mr Roberts has bred pedigree Charolais sheep, and in addition slightly diversified his farming to breeding rabbits. He has further supplemented his farming by being a drystone walling contractor.

The reason for Mr Robert's requirement for the house at the farm can be more than justified in him keeping breeding livestock which need daily care all year around.”

Response: Officers are of the opinion the a case for a worker to be on site, on grounds of animal welfare can be made however, the applicant has failed sufficiently demonstrate that the existing enterprise is financially sound to sustain a permanent need for an agricultural/rural worker both now and as can reasonably be seen ahead, having regard to Policy PLP55 of the Kirklees Local Plan.

This page is intentionally left blank