
Report of the Head of Strategic Investment

HUDDERSFIELD PLANNING SUB-COMMITTEE

Date: 09-Aug-2018

Subject: Planning Application 2018/91685 Erection of single storey rear extension 9, Clough Head, Slaithwaite Gate, Bolster Moor, Huddersfield, HD7 4NW

APPLICANT

Chris Friend

DATE VALID

29-May-2018

TARGET DATE

24-Jul-2018

EXTENSION EXPIRY DATE

Please click the following link for guidance notes on public speaking at planning committees, including how to pre-register your intention to speak.

<http://www.kirklees.gov.uk/beta/planning-applications/pdf/public-speaking-committee.pdf>

LOCATION PLAN



Map not to scale – for identification purposes only

Electoral Wards Affected: Colne Valley

No

Ward Members consulted

RECOMMENDATION: DELEGATE approval and the issuing of the decision notice to the Head of Strategic Investment in order to complete the list of conditions including those contained within this report.

1.0 INTRODUCTION:

- 1.1 The application is brought to the Sub Committee in accordance with the Scheme of Delegation because the applicant is related to an employee of Planning Services.

2.0 SITE AND SURROUNDINGS:

- 2.1 The application relates to 9 Clough Head, Slaithwaite Gate at Bolster Moor. The property forms a two storey dwelling with a detached garage to the side and amenity space to the front and rear. Associated with the property is a large field which extends to the south and northeast. The site lies in a rural area and is adjacent to a former reservoir (Golcar Service Reservoir).

3.0 PROPOSAL:

- 3.1 The application is for a single storey rear extension. This is a modified proposal of a previously refused application for extensions to the dwelling and other operational development within the adjacent land.
- 3.2 The proposed rear extension would project beyond the existing two storey rear extension by 3m and would be just under 4m in height. It would extend beyond a side wall of the dwelling by 1.5m.
- 3.3 The extension would have a flat roof with natural stone capping. A ramped access with black balustrade would be formed to the side of the dwelling providing level access into the extension. The extension would form a sun room, enlarged kitchen area and utility room.
- 3.4 Coursed natural stone to match the existing dwelling would be used for the external walls. Windows would be PVC with natural stone heads and cills.
- 3.5 The plans show that an existing double door to the side elevation is to be blocked up to cill level and replaced with a window.

4.0 RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY:

2017/92422 Erection of single storey side and rear extensions to dwelling, erection of machinery store and engineering operations – Refused by Committee 23/11/17

2013/91419 Erection of pitched roof (to existing two storey rear extension) – Approved

5.0 HISTORY OF NEGOTIATIONS:

5.1 No negotiations have been undertaken.

6.0 PLANNING POLICY:

6.1 Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires that planning applications are determined in accordance with the Development Plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The Development Plan for Kirklees currently comprises the saved policies within the Kirklees Unitary Development Plan (Saved 2007). The Council's Local Plan was submitted to the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government on 25th April 2017, so that it can be examined by an independent inspector. The Examination in Public began in October 2017. The weight to be given to the Local Plan will be determined in accordance with the guidance in paragraph 48 of the National Planning Policy Framework. In particular, where the policies, proposals and designations in the Local Plan do not vary from those within the UDP, do not attract significant unresolved objections and are consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework (2018), these may be given increased weight. At this stage of the Plan making process the Publication Draft Local Plan is considered to carry significant weight. Pending the adoption of the Local Plan, the UDP (saved Policies 2007) remains the statutory Development Plan for Kirklees.

6.2 The site is allocated as Green Belt on the UDP Proposals Map and is allocated as Green Belt in the Draft Publication Local Plan.

Kirklees Unitary Development Plan (UDP) Saved Policies 2007:

6.3 BE1 – Design principles
BE13 – Extensions to dwellings (design principles)
BE14 – Extensions to dwellings (scale)
D11 - Extensions in the Green Belt

Draft Publication Local Plan:

PLP24 – Design
PLP57 – Extensions within the Green Belt

National Planning Guidance:

NPPF Chapter 12 – Achieving well-designed places
NPPF Chapter 13 - Protecting Green Belt land

7.0 PUBLIC/LOCAL RESPONSE:

7.1 The application was advertised by site notice. No representations have been received.

8.0 CONSULTATION RESPONSES:

8.1 No consultation was carried out.

9.0 MAIN ISSUES

- Principle of development
- Impact on the openness and visual amenity of the Green Belt
- Residential amenity
- Highway issues

10.0 APPRAISAL

Principle of development:

10.1 The site lies within the Green Belt and the main issue is the impact of the proposed extension on the openness and visual amenity of the Green Belt.

10.2 Paragraph 145 of the NPPF states that a local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in Green Belt. Exceptions to this include the extension or alteration of a building provided that it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building.

10.3 Policy D11 of the UDP relates to extensions to buildings within the Green Belt and states that:

Proposals for the extension of buildings within the green belt will be considered having regard to:

- i the impact on the openness and character of the green belt;
- ii the size of the extension in relation to the existing building which should remain the dominant element;

and, in the case of traditional buildings,

- iii the effect on the character of the existing building.

In the case of proposals to extend buildings which have already been extended the proposal should have regard to the scale and character of the original part of the building.

10.4 Policy PLP 57 of the emerging Local Plan relates to the extension, alteration or replacement of existing buildings within the Green Belt. It states:

Proposals for the extension, alteration or replacement of buildings in the green belt will normally be acceptable provided that:

- a. in the case of extensions the host building remains the dominant element both in terms of size and overall appearance. The cumulative impact of previous extensions and of other associated buildings will be taken into account. Proposals to extend buildings which have already been extended should have regard to the scale and character of the original part of the building;
 - b. in the case of replacement buildings, the new building must be in the same use as and not be materially larger than the building it is replacing;
 - c. the proposal does not result in a greater impact on openness in terms of the treatment of outdoor areas, including hard standings, curtilages and enclosures and means of access; and
 - d. the design and materials used should be sensitive to the character of the green belt setting.
- 10.5 The principle of the development is accepted subject to an assessment of the above policies.

Impact on the openness of the Green Belt:

- 10.6 In order to assess the proposed extensions in relation to local and national Green Belt policy it is first necessary to establish what constitutes the original building. The original building is defined as a building as it existed on 1st July 1948 (if it was built before that date) or as it was built when built after 1st July 1948. The property was built in the 19th century and therefore in this case the original building means as it existed on 1st July 1948.
- 10.7 Officers considered this matter under the previous application. It was concluded that there have been extensions to the original dwelling in the form of a two storey rear extension (erected circa 1967 with a pitched roof added circa 2013) plus a small single storey utility extension also to the rear. There is however evidence to indicate that these extensions were partially erected in place of a part of the original building which projected out at the rear of the dwelling; it is not known however whether the part that was replaced was single or two storeys in height.
- 10.8 A garage exists to the side of the dwelling. Officers consider this to be an addition to the dwelling, i.e. erected post 1st July 1948. The garage is quite substantial and is closely associated with the dwelling, being less than 1m from the side wall. The garage therefore needs to be taken into account when assessing the extent of additions and extensions to the original building.
- 10.9 There is evidence from historic maps and aerial photographs that there were two small outbuildings at the rear of the property which were original features. One of these was demolished less than fifteen years ago and the other was demolished in 2013. Officers consider that it reasonable to take the presence of these outbuildings into account when considering the extent of the original building.

- 10.10 The existing rear extension and garage approximately double the volume of the original part of the house that still remains. A proportion of the additional volume provided by the extension is however off-set by the part of the original building that was demolished to make way for the existing rear extension.
- 10.11 The proposed development will add to the volume increase of the original dwelling, which officers estimate to be approximately 70%. The question is whether the proposed extension represents a disproportionate addition to this particular dwelling considering what has previously been added.
- 10.12 The proposed extension is single storey with a flat roof and lies to the rear of the dwelling, albeit projecting by a short distance (1.5m) beyond side wall of the house. This part of the site is where two small original outbuildings once stood and is currently used as a patio area and contains a garden shed. This area is bound by a stone wall to the rear and is partially screened on one side by a grassy embankment associated with the adjoining former reservoir land.
- 10.13 The location of the extension is such that it does not significantly add to the sprawl of the dwelling and its visual prominence from surrounding land is limited. The extension would mainly be visible from southerly directions because it is obscured by an embankment to the north, would principally be seen against the backdrop of the existing dwelling within long range vistas from the east and it is only the projecting element at the side of the house that would be visible from the west.
- 10.14 The cumulative volume increase of the existing and proposed additions to the original building is substantial although the main bulk of the existing and proposed additions are single storey and predominantly concentrated towards the rear of dwelling where the extent of the property is contained by the former reservoir land.
- 10.15 In this instance it is considered that the scale and location of the extension are such that it would not significantly harm the openness of the Green Belt. As such officers do not consider that the proposal would represent a disproportionate addition. This is subject to permitted development rights being removed for any further extensions or outbuildings being erected.
- 10.16 Under the previous application it was the large sun room extension to the side of the dwelling which was a particular cause for concern and this has now been omitted.
- 10.17 In summary it is considered that the impact on the openness of the Green Belt is acceptable and the application accords with Policy D11 of the UDP, Policy PLP 57 of the emerging Local Plan and guidance in chapter 13 of the NPPF.

Visual amenity of the Green Belt:

- 10.18 The single storey scale of the extension and its location at the rear of the dwelling attached to an existing extension help to ensure that the original building remains the dominant element.
- 10.19 The design and materials harmonise with the host building which also helps to maintain the character of the existing dwelling.

10.20 The extension would not result in any significant harm to the visual amenity of the Green Belt in officers' view and the application accords with Policy D11 of the UDP, Policy PLP 57 of the emerging Local Plan and guidance in chapter 13 of the NPPF.

Residential Amenity

10.21 The property forms a fairly isolated dwelling with no immediate neighbouring properties and as such there would be no significant impact on residential amenity.

Highway issues

10.22 The proposals do not give rise to any significant highway safety issues.

Other matters:

10.23 No representations have been received and there are not considered to be any other matters that would materially alter the assessment of the application.

11.0 CONCLUSION

11.1 The proposal would not result in a disproportionate addition to the original building having regard to the scale and location of the extension and taking into account the existing extensions/additions to the property. The design is in keeping with the host building and would preserve the character of the dwellinghouse and the surrounding area.

12.0 CONDITIONS (Summary list. Full wording of conditions including any amendments/additions to be delegated to the Head of Strategic Investment)

1. Time limit condition
2. Development in accordance with approved plans
3. Materials to match existing dwelling
4. Permitted development rights removed for extensions and outbuildings

Background Papers:

Application and history files.

Website link:

<http://www.kirklees.gov.uk/beta/planning-applications/search-for-planning-applications/detail.aspx?id=2018%2f91685>

Certificate of Ownership – Certificate A signed