

KIRKLEES METROPOLITAN COUNCIL

PLANNING SERVICE

UPDATE OF LIST OF PLANNING APPLICATIONS TO BE DECIDED BY PLANNING SUB-COMMITTEE (HUDDERSFIELD AREA)

4 AUGUST 2016

APPLICATION NO: 2015/93861

PAGE 9

ERECTION OF 28 DWELLINGS AND ENGINEERING OPERATIONS

LAND OFF, MILLMOOR ROAD, MELTHAM, HOLMFIRTH

Since the publication of the committee report, one further representation has been received from the occupier of no.78d Mill Moor Road. The main body of the representation is set out below:

We are writing to you to re-iterate that the measures the applicant is proposing and which are included in the committee report for the planning meeting on 4th August do not address our concerns relating to our Residential Amenity. We refer you to our previous correspondence, but essentially changing the plots closest to our boundary so that their gardens are facing our boundary would address our concerns.

We would also like to point out that there is an error on page 22 of the report that you have prepared for the committee. The relevant text has been highlighted below.

*“The owner of 78d has requested that a screen fence is provided along the boundary to preserve their privacy. **No windows are proposed in the side of plot 1** although the proximity and relative height of the curtilage for plot 1 is likely to give rise to a sense of being overlooked.”*

The drawing of the East elevation of plots 1 to 3 (Drawing #29 Rev. A) clearly shows a window on the first floor and the occupants of plot 1 would therefore overlook our conservatory leading to loss of privacy. We still require the fence that the developer has agreed to install but there is still an impact to our amenity even with the fence in place. If these plots were turned through 90 degrees as previously stated on numerous occasions the impact on amenity of our property would be significantly reduced.

Response: It is noted the side elevation of plot 1 does include 1 window at first floor level to serve a landing. However the landing is classified as a non-habitable room as such Officers do not consider that the window on the side elevation would lead to a detrimental overlooking impact to the occupiers of no.78d. To prevent any potential for overlooking the window will be conditioned to be obscurely glazed. Officers consider that this condition

combined with the non-habitable nature of the room will prevent any detrimental overlooking impact to the occupiers of no.78d. Furthermore the removal of permitted development rights for extensions and the provision of a boundary fence for plot 1 as set out in the committee report will ensure that the amenity of the occupier of no.78d is sufficiently protected.

Officers have also considered the suggestion of rotating plots adjacent to no.78d to have gardens and the rear elevations facing the side and garden of no.78d. Officers consider that such a proposal would lead to a greater degree of overlooking of the garden and conservatory of no.78d, from windows at first floor level to the detriment of their amenity. Furthermore such an arrangement would be detrimental to the street scene of Mill Moor Road and the entrance to the development, by introducing a blank gable end where currently an active frontage is proposed.

The occupier of no.78d has also requested that plot 1 be marked out on site for members to assess the impact of plot 1 on no.78d.

Response: Officers considered the request, but do not consider that it is necessary as members will be able to assess the relationship between no.78d to the application site, and proposed development based on the site visit and the submitted plans.

APPLICATION NO: 2016/90477

PAGE 37

ALTERATIONS TO CONVERT OUTBUILDING TO HOLIDAY ACCOMMODATION

ADJ 1, WHEAT CLOSE, HOLMBRIDGE, HOLMFIRTH, HD9 2QL

This application was previously considered by members at the last committee on the 30 June 2016. Since then, the application has been under review following complaints by a local resident and ward councillors that information relevant to the determination of the application was not included in the committee report and that the discussion at the meeting did not clearly identify the enforcement planning history. This review is currently on going and has not been completed. Officers therefore recommend that members defer this application until the review is concluded then the application will be returned to committee.

A statement has also been submitted by the applicant's agent in support of the proposal as he is not able to attend the meeting. This statement will be read out at committee if the application is not deferred.

Officer Amended Recommendation: Defer
