

KIRKLEES METROPOLITAN COUNCIL

PLANNING SERVICE

UPDATE OF LIST OF PLANNING APPLICATIONS TO BE DECIDED BY

PLANNING SUB-COMMITTEE (HUDDERSFIELD AREA)

9 DECEMBER 2020

Planning Application 2019/93124

Item 7 – Page 11

Change of use from agricultural to storage and processing of timber, formation of access track and hardstanding and siting of containers

Land east of, Hillock Farm, Dean Road, Upperthong, Holmfirth, HD9 3XB

Residential amenity issues

Noise impact: paragraphs 10.38-10.40 of the report

The noise concerns raised in representations made during the course of the application have been forwarded to Environmental Services. Whilst this is acknowledged, Environmental Services have more recently reiterated that noise generated by activities at the site, as set out in the submitted noise report and referred to in para 10.39 of the report, would not unduly impact on the amenity of nearby noise sensitive properties. This is provided that the development is undertaken in accordance with the details set out in submitted noise report.

Planning Application 2020/91885

Item 9 – Page 89

Demolition of existing store/stable, erection of detached dwelling with integral garage and modifications to existing access lane (within a Conservation Area) (modified proposal)

Reddisher Farm, Reddisher Road, Marsden, Huddersfield, HD7 6NF

5 additional representations have been received which are summarised below:

- The amended plans do not address the concerns with regard to the scale of the development and its impact on the local landscape and harm to the openness of the Green Belt. This issue has been exacerbated now the leaves have fallen off the trees making the site more prominent. The proposal is harmful to the character of the local area.
- The scheme now proposed is barely distinguishable to the unlawful development constructed and has not returned the scheme back to a scale that was previously approved.
- The detrimental impact of the development on the Green Belt is significant and any further increase in scale on the scheme previously approved should not be supported.

- To state the site cannot be seen locally in misleading, it is clearly visible across the valley and within 1 to 2 miles highlighting its detrimental impact on the local landscape and the openness of the Green Belt.

Response: For the reasons set out in the published committee report, the scheme as now proposed is, on balance, considered to have an acceptable impact on the openness of the Green Belt, the local landscape and the character and appearance of the local area.

- Local residents were not aware of the proposals to form the dwelling under previous applications and it is only when construction work commenced that the impact has been brought to the attention of local residents.

Response: The original application was publicised by site notice and neighbour notification letter, in accordance with the Council's Development Management Charter. Comments received relating to the current application have now been considered.

- Work has commenced without following the permission from the start seeking a larger dwelling than previously approved. How can a 3 bedroom dwelling get approved, work commence not following the permission and then a 5 bedroom dwelling get constructed?
- Why can't the original permission be enforced?

Response: It is noted that work undertaken on site has not followed the approved plans and these complaints have brought about the submission of this planning application. The published committee report has considered the amended scheme in detail which, on balance, is considered to be acceptable. With regard to enforcement action, the first step is the determination of the application before members which has been submitted to retrospectively seek to rectify a breach of planning control.

- Local residents only received the letter informing them of amended plans on 4th December when the letter was dated 20 November, therefore all comments received should be considered.

Response: These comments are noted and it would appear that there has been a technical error with the sending of some e-mails or the receiving of letters via Royal Mail which may have caused the delays. However, the scheme now proposed is a lesser scheme to that originally proposed and comments to the original scheme have been considered in detail in the published committee report.

- Spoil material from the site has been tipped on an adjacent field raising ground levels and potentially increasing flooding and has changed the appearance of the local landscape. The spoil has also contained building materials or waste which has in turn reduced the quality of the fields.

Response: The applicant has stated that land levels around the building will be regraded and returned to the previous condition once construction is complete. Once this work is complete potential for flood risk by surface water run off should be mitigated.

- The applicant has used gabion baskets at the site for retaining walls which are inappropriate when stone walls are the predominate material for retaining structures.

Response: The stated gabion walls would be filled with natural stone and such an approach is considered to be acceptable.

Planning Application 2020/92400

Item – 10 – Page 105

Erection of detached garage

Brigsteer, 402, Birkby Road, Birkby, Huddersfield, HD2 2DN

One additional representation has been received which is summarised below:

- Concern is raised over the reliance on the use of a screen boundary fence to make the scheme acceptable. Any fence is considered to require planning permission as it does not form part of this submission.

Response: As set out in the published committee report, the assessment of the application has not relied upon the provision of a screen boundary fence and the impact of the garage as proposed is considered to be acceptable.

This page is intentionally left blank