
Report of the Head of Planning and Development

HUDDERSFIELD PLANNING SUB-COMMITTEE

Date: 10-Feb-2022

**Subject: Planning Application 2021/93655 Erection of two storey extension
212, Bradford Road, Fartown, Huddersfield, HD1 6LJ**

APPLICANT

K Rafique

DATE VALID

15-Sep-2021

TARGET DATE

10-Nov-2021

EXTENSION EXPIRY DATE

12-Jan-2022

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

[Public speaking at committee link](#)

LOCATION PLAN



Map not to scale – for identification purposes only

Electoral wards affected: Greenhead

Ward Councillors consulted: No

Public or private: Public

RECOMMENDATION:

That permission be REFUSED for the following reasons:-

1. By virtue of its design and scale the proposed development would result in an incongruous feature being introduced to the street scene which would not be subservient and fail to harmonise with the host property having a detrimental impact on the visual amenity and character of the building and wider street scene contrary to policy LP24 part (a) and part (c) of the Kirklees Local Plan and policies within chapter 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework.
2. The proposed development, by reason of its size and proximity to no.214 Bradford Road and nos. 2 & 4 Back Beech Terrace would lead to an unacceptable level of overshadowing and be unduly overbearing and oppressive, having a detrimental impact on the amenities of the occupiers of these properties contrary to policy LP24 part (b) of the Kirklees Local Plan and policies within chapter 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework.
3. The proposed creation of a raised terrace would lead to an unacceptable level of overlooking of the occupiers of no.214 Bradford Road, nos.2 & 4 Back Beech Terrace and no.2 Olive Street, having a detrimental impact on the amenities of the occupiers of these properties contrary to policy LP24 part (b) of the Kirklees Local Plan and policies within chapter 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

1.0 INTRODUCTION:

1.1 This application is brought to committee at the request of Ward Councillor M. Sokhal.

1.2 Cllr M. Sokhal has confirmed the reasons for their request are as follows: -

“The amended proposal has removed a pitch roof to be replaced by a lean-to roof which would reduce over shadowing. The overall reduction in size and projection would also reduce the overbearing issue. The windows are significantly reduced and as stated, the windows are to be frosted so negate any overlooking issues towards Back Beech Terrace”.

1.3 The Chair of the Sub-Committee has confirmed that Cllr M Sokhal's reasons for the referral to the committee are valid having regard to the Councillor's Protocol for Planning Committees.

2.0 SITE AND SURROUNDINGS:

- 2.1 No. 212 is a two storey, end terraced property constructed of natural stone and slate tile. It benefits from a small front yard bounded by low stone walls and a flat roofed rear dormer. To the rear is rear amenity space part bounded by stone walls. The plot falls from northwest to southeast.
- 2.2 The host property has a single storey flat roof structure to the rear of the property within a small yard, which is bounded by stone walls to Back Beech Terrace, a cobblestoned side street. A narrow unadopted alleyway entitled "access to rear of 212-224 Bradford Road" is shared between the terraced row connecting Back Beech Terrace to Olive Street.
- 2.3 The site has been subject to a change of use from residential to office use in 2020. The office use has been undertaken, the host property retains its residential appearance with signage above the window, to the southern elevation is signage and two large, wide windows on the ground floor facing undesignated public green space.
- 2.4 The site has a basement at lower ground floor, hallway and two offices on the ground floor with a kitchen within the outrigger, two store-rooms, bathroom with landing at first floor and within its dormer, storage space within the roof.
- 2.5 The site is on the southern boundary edge of the Fartown Local Centre, and it is in a High Coal Risk area.
- 2.6 The host property is located on a street that is predominately residential with properties of a similar age and style. To the north are dwellings of a terraced design with the corner plot between Bradford Street and Olive Street being a Funeral Director. To the east, south and west are residential properties and industrial plots mainly for storage use to the further east of the site.

3.0 PROPOSAL:

- 3.1 The applicant is seeking permission for a two-storey rear extension and a single storey rear extension to 212 Bradford Road.
- 3.2 The two-storey rear extension is to include the outrigger and would have a lean-to roof form. It would extend 5m from the rear elevation and be the full span of the rear elevation of the host at 5.2m width. The lean-to roof ridge height would be 5.8m and the eaves would be 4.9m height from the adjacent ground level. On the south elevation, this would retain a door with steps up to the outrigger, a large and wide obscured window to the lower ground level and an identical obscured window to the ground level of the two-storey rear extension.
- 3.3 On the east elevation, a door would open out onto the roof of the single storey extension. To the north elevation, no openings by way of windows or doors are proposed. Set out on Elevation Plans, the north elevation of the two-storey rear extension would appear as single storey to the neighbouring property to the north.

- 3.4 A single storey element would be extended 2.5m from the rear of the two-storey rear extension and be 5.2m width. The remaining section of the rear garden at 0.95m by 5.2m would have a boundary stone wall of 0.95m width and 2.5m height adjacent to Back Beech Terrace. Both the single storey extension and the last remaining section of outside amenity space would be roofed with flat roof structure which would have a green roof that would be at 2.5m height. Amenity space would be in place upon this flat roof structure accessed from a door in the rear elevation.
- 3.5 The walls including the boundary wall are proposed to be constructed of natural stone with a lean to roof in grey tiles to match the host.
- 3.6 The proposal seeks to add an office to lower ground floor, an office to the ground floor with the rooms within the host building to remain unaltered. It would add approximately 170sqm of office space between two offices.

4.0 RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY (including enforcement history):

- 4.1 2021/91999 – Erection of two storey extension. Refused 17th August 2021 for the following reasons:-

1. The proposed extension by reason of its scale and appearance, in particular its projection and large window fenestration would lead to a detrimental impact on character and appearance of the local area, particularly the street scene along Back Beech Terrace and would not represent a subservient addition to the host property. The proposal would therefore be contrary to Policy LP24 (a) & (c) of the Kirklees Local Plan and Policies in Chapter 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

2. The proposed extension by reason of its projection and height would lead to a detrimental overshadowing and overbearing impact on no. 214 Bradford Road. In addition by reason of the large windows on the southern elevation combined with its projection and overall height would lead to a detrimental overbearing and overlooking impact on no.s 2 & 4 Back Beech Terrace. The proposal would therefore be contrary to Policy LP24 (b) of the Kirklees Local Plan and Policies in Chapter 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

- 4.2 2020/93006 – Change of use from dwelling to office. Approved.

- 4.3 Planning history also considered of relevance:

2003/95170 – 222/224 Bradford Road. Change of use of retail shop to funeral parlour with living accommodation over and attached garage. Approved.

- 4.4 It is noted that the proposal is a re submission of the previously refused application (ref:- 2021/91999)

5.0 HISTORY OF NEGOTIATIONS (including revisions to the scheme):

- 5.1 There were multiple issues to the previous application (ref: - 2021/91999) which was refused, these were considered too significant under the previous application. As such, amended plans were not sought. Following refusal with the issuance of the Delegated Report setting out the reasons, the agent and applicant undertook a meeting to discuss amendments, whereby concerns in terms of design and advice in relation to scale back / reduce the scale and size

of the proposal and reduce overdevelopment and impact on residential amenity were raised. The previous application 2021/91999 proposed that there be a two-storey rear extension with the following features:

- Gable roof with a roof ridge height of 5.8m and eaves height of 4.7m from ground level
- Projection of 7.5m from the rear by 5.2m
- To the south elevation, frosted glass windows at 4.2m width by 1.0m height lower ground and another frosted glass window at 3.3m width and 1.8m at ground floor. No other openings

5.2 It was advised that there be a two-storey extension projecting no more than 3m from the rear elevation to avoid these issues. The agent and applicant put forward that the poorly secured rear outside amenity space had issues of fly-tipping and rubbish as an issue applicable to the consideration of any future application.

5.3 The Application was resubmitted following advice from the LPA with attention drawn to the Delegated Report for application 2021/91999 proposing a two-storey rear extension with lean to roof projecting 5.9m from the rear by 5.2m width with a roof ridge height of 5.8m and eaves at 4.8m from ground level and a single storey rear extension projecting further from the rear elevation of the two-storey rear extension 1.6m by 5.2m width with a boundary wall and green roof at 2.5m. This would build over the entirety of the rear outside amenity space.

5.4 The agent was contacted advising that this scheme, whilst reduced, could not be supported on grounds of overdevelopment, visual and residential amenity. Officers amended plans which are being considered. The two-storey rear extension has been reduced in projection by 0.9m, with a similar roof ridge height and eaves height, and the single storey rear extension with boundary wall remains to extend over the remaining rear amenity space.

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 statutory Development Plan for Kirklees is the Local Plan (adopted 27th February 2019).

6.2 The site falls within a Local Centre (Fartown) as identified within the Kirklees Local Plan. The site also falls within an area at risk of ground movement as a result of former mining activity as identified by the Coal Authority.

Kirklees Local Plan (2019):

6.3 The most relevant policies of the Kirklees Local Plan (2019) are:

- LP1 – Presumption in favour of sustainable development
- LP2 – Place shaping
- LP13 – Town centre uses
- LP21 – Highways and access
- LP22 – Parking

- LP24 – Design
- LP53 – Contaminated and unstable land

Supplementary Planning Guidance / Documents:

6.4 None.

National Planning Guidance:

6.5 National planning policy and guidance is set out in National Policy Statements, primarily the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), published 20/07/2021, the National Design Guide published 01/10/2019 and the Planning Practice Guidance Suite (PPGS), first launched 06/03/2014, together with Circulars, Ministerial Statements and associated technical guidance.

6.6 The NPPF constitutes guidance for local planning authorities and is a material consideration in determining applications, the following chapters being considered applicable in this case: -

- Chapter 2 – Achieving sustainable development
- Chapter 4 – Decision-making
- Chapter 6 – Building a strong, competitive economy
- Chapter 7 – Ensuring the vitality of town centres
- Chapter 12 – Achieving well-designed places
- Chapter 14 – Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding, and coastal changes

7.0 PUBLIC/LOCAL RESPONSE:

7.1 Publication of the application has been undertaken in accordance with the Council's Development Management Charter (July 2015).

7.2 The application has been advertised by neighbour letter which expired 03/11/2021 for interested parties to comment. No response has been received.

8.0 CONSULTATION RESPONSES:

8.1 Statutory:

Coal Authority – No objection subject to condition

8.2 Non-statutory:

None

9.0 MAIN ISSUES

- Principle of development
- Urban design issues
- Residential amenity
- Landscape issues
- Housing issues
- Highway issues
- Drainage issues
- Planning obligations
- Representations
- Other matters

10.0 APPRAISAL

Principle of development

- 10.1 The site is within the Fartown Local Centre on the Kirklees Local Plan (KLP). Policy LP13 of the KLP is relevant wherein a mix of uses to serve the local community, businesses and visitors to the Local Centre is desirable and the proposal in expanding office space to a business would have no conflict with this policy.
- 10.2 In addition, Chapters 6 and 7 of the NPPF are relevant with paragraph 81 setting out that *“Planning policies and decisions should help create the conditions in which businesses can invest, expand and adapt. Significant weight should be placed on the need to support economic growth and productivity, taking into account both local business needs and wider opportunities for development.”*
- 10.3 Planning Officers have not received information in relation to how the expansion is considered to be critical to the function of the business. Whilst it is noted that the proposed development would support a business, this is still within a predominantly residential area and that Policy LP1 and LP24 of the Kirklees Local Plan remain relevant in the consideration of this application.
- 10.4 Policy LP1 of the KLP states that when considering development proposals, the Council will take a positive approach that reflects the presumption in favour of sustainable development contained in the NPPF. In terms of extending and making alterations to a property, Policy LP24 of the KLP is relevant, in conjunction with the policies contained within Chapter 12 of the NPPF, regarding design.
- 10.5 In this case, the principle of development is considered acceptable, and the proposal shall now be assessed against all other material planning considerations, including visual and residential amenity, as well as highway safety.

Urban Design issues

- 10.6 The NPPF offers guidance relating to design in chapter 12 (Achieving well-designed places) whereby paragraph 126 provides a principal consideration concerning design which states:

“The creation of high quality, beautiful and sustainable buildings and places is fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve. Good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, creates better places in which to live and work and helps make development acceptable to communities.”

- 10.7 Policy LP24 (Design) of the Council’s adopted Local Plan sets out that proposals should promote good design by ensuring the form, scale, layout and details of all development respects and enhances the character of the townscape, extensions are subservient to the original building, are in keeping with the existing buildings in terms of scale, materials and details and minimise impact on residential amenity of future and neighbouring occupiers.

- 10.8 Paragraph 130 of the NPPF is of relevance, in particular the following parts:-

- *‘b) Planning policies and decisions should ensure that developments are visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and appropriate and effective landscaping*
- *c) Planning policies and decisions should ensure that developments are sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting, while not preventing or discouraging appropriate innovation or change (such as increased densities)’*

- 10.9 The property is located on a residential street with other properties of a similar age and some of the houses have been extended and altered. Dependent upon design, scale and detailing, it may be acceptable to extend the host property.

- 10.10 The neighbouring property (no.214) is residential which has had its 1.5 storey half span rear outrigger extended upwards to have an additional storey to form a 2.5 storey rear outrigger to the northwest of the property and within a similar original footprint. Both the host property and no.214 were the only properties extended in this fashion within their terraced row.

- 10.11 To the north end of the terraced row, is the Funeral Director which benefited from permission (ref: - 2003/95170) to add an attached garage within the rear amenity space. It is acknowledged that the Agent cited this application as an example of development taking up the rear amenity space. Whilst a large extension, the impact is minimised due to it being a single storey extension set against a two-storey building and is within a recognisably more commercial area which would not be out of character for its setting. The garaging facility for a Funeral Director within the ground floor would be considered a necessary feature to support the business given the requirement for privacy from onlookers. Further impact is limited by having no windows facing residential neighbours so they would not be overlooked.

- 10.12 Otherwise within the immediate area, two storey extensions to the rear are not typical and most dwellings have their rear amenity space undeveloped. Some examples of large, buildings can be found either original or on historic large building plots to the southwest but otherwise properties are of terraced form. The host property is 5.2m in width and 8.9m in depth. Akin to surrounding properties, the fenestration of the local area with terraced properties are of vertical, tall, and narrow design which is consistent in the streetscene including those of commercial properties adding to its consistent streetscene.
- 10.13 The proposal under consideration consists of two distinct elements which shall be addressed below.
- 10.14 *Two Storey Rear Extension:* The two-storey rear extension would appear to subservient to its 2.5 storey rear elevation aided by its lean to roof and exposure of the original rear elevation of the host. However, with the projection of the two-storey extension at 5m from the rear elevation and being the full width of the host property, this element would not form a subservient addition to the property. Furthermore, the property is located in an area which is characterised by little development of the rear amenity space.
- 10.15 The use of a full width two storey height extension would be out of character with the wider area. The proposal seeks to add two obscured windows approximately 1.95m in width and 1.2m in height to the opposite of two residential dwellings, this would not appear consistent with the surrounding properties in the streetscene however it would be consistent with the large windows on the south side elevation of the property facing undesignated green space. The cumulative impact of the large fenestration facing a residential property would appear out of keeping in the area. As such, despite the use of matching materials, the proposed two storey rear extension is not considered to be acceptable in terms of visual amenity.
- 10.16 It is therefore considered that the proposed two storey element would not form a subservient addition given its size and design and would be out of character with the host property and not constitute a harmonising feature when viewed in the context of the existing dwelling. This element is therefore not considered to be acceptable in terms of impact of the character / visual amenities of the host property and wider locality.
- 10.17 *Single Storey Rear Extension:* The single storey rear extension would adjoin the two-storey rear extension cumulatively adding to the bulk and massing of the host property and in conjunction with its boundary wall and flat roof would take up the remaining outside amenity space to the rear. It would have a flat roof design with a green roof and be sited within sloping ground which would aid in providing for some openness however the cumulative impact of development would not respect the form, scale, and layout of the townscape. The proposed green roof with doorway access would create a roof terrace in a residential area at close quarters to other residential properties which would be out of keeping with the area. As such, the design will result in a substantial overdevelopment and add an alien feature with the roof terrace design to the rear of the property.

Despite the use of appropriate materials, the design and scale at the rear is not acceptable given the development of the whole rear amenity space and its additional substantial bulk and massing. The single storey rear extension is not considered to be acceptable in terms of visual amenity.

- 10.18 Having taken the above into account, the proposed extensions would extend 7.5m which would nearly double the original 8.9m depth of its host building and would cause significant harm to the visual amenity of the host dwellings and the wider street scene. The fenestration would be visually out of keeping and the design would lead to an over development of the plot. The proposal is therefore concluded to be contrary to Policy LP24 of the Kirklees Local Plan (a) in terms of the form, scale, and layout and (c) as the extension would not form a subservient addition to the property in keeping with the existing building and the policies within chapter 12 paragraph 130 b), c) and e) of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Residential Amenity

- 10.19 Paragraph 130 of the NPPF requires that planning decisions ensure developments create places that are safe, inclusive and accessible and which promote health and well-being, with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users. Furthermore, policy LP24(b) of the Kirklees Local Plan sets out that:-

'proposals should promote good design by ensuring: b. they provide a high standard of amenity for future and neighbouring occupiers; including maintaining appropriate distances between buildings and the creation of development-free buffer zones between housing and employment uses incorporating means of screening where necessary'

- 10.20 Also of relevance is part (f) of paragraph 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework which sets out that planning policies and decisions should ensure that developments create places that are safe, inclusive and accessible and which promote health and well-being, with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users.

- 10.21 *Impact on 214 Bradford Road:* Currently this property has a half span outrigger and a rear outside amenity plot that is southeast facing, it enjoys sunlight exposure until late afternoon most of the year to two windows at the ground floor. The rear extension would be constructed along the shared boundary with the adjoining and would extend 5m. To the rear of both properties is sloping ground falling to southeast which would exacerbate the overshadowing impact that the single storey extension would have.

- 10.22 Whilst appearing single storey in scale from no.214, its projection at 5 metres and its overall height at 3.8 metres and eaves height of 3 metres and orientation, in conjunction with the proposed two storey element, would lead to an unacceptable level of overshadowing and overbearing to the windows in the rear elevation of the ground floor of no.214 and its associated amenity space.

- 10.23 The proposed terrace would enable users of the terrace to walk / sit / stand and look back over the rear elevation and amenity space of no.214. To screen this terrace would add to the developments overshadowing and oppressive impact which has already been identified as to an unacceptable level. As mitigation for the overlooking impact of the terrace is not considered to be possible in relation to overlooking of no.214 it is considered that the proposal would be unacceptable in terms of overlooking of this property.
- 10.24 *Impact on 2 Olive Street:* This proposal would add a glazed door to the east elevation of the ground floor of the two-storey extension, which would open out to the green roof. The proposed would create a roof terrace which would be out of keeping in a residential area adding an overlooking vantage point over No. 2's rear garden including its single storey outbuilding. Due to the position of the rear elevation windows of No.2 (17m northeast of the proposed), it would not provide for direct views into habitable windows but would allow overlooking over the rear amenity space of this property for which mitigation (in the form of a privacy screen) is not considered to be practicable and is considered to raise other issues such as visual impact. As such the impact to this property as a result of overlooking is not considered to be acceptable.
- 10.25 *Impact on 2 & 4 Back Beech Terrace:* The habitable windows of these properties face the side of the proposal which would be across the entirety of the front of these properties, including large windows facing them, with a separation distance of 9.8 metres. The limited separation distance between the two properties combined with the large, obscured glazing on the lower ground and the ground floors and the roof terrace proposed is considered to lead to a detrimental overlooking impact occurring from the proposed extension to both the ground and first floors of the properties' habitable windows.
- 10.26 Given the size and scale of the proposed building and fact it would be directly opposite these flats for the entire frontage it is considered there would be an oppressive impact from the proposal to these properties. Furthermore, it is considered that the proposal would lead to overshadowing to the ground floor property. It is therefore considered the proposal would have a detrimental impact to the occupiers of these properties as a result of overlooking, overshadowing and being oppressive.
- 10.27 *Impact on 215 Bradford Road:* The neighbour on the opposite side of the road would have the proposal blocked from view by the bulk and massing of the host building and the proposal is considered to have no undue impact on the amenities of the occupiers of this property as a result.
- 10.28 Having considered the above factors, the close proximity of the two-storey rear extension to the adjoining property and creation of a roof terrace the proposal would result in a significantly oppressive and overbearing development with a detrimental overshadowing impact to no.214 Bradford Road and lead to a detrimental level of overlooking of this property, 2 & 4 Back Beech Terrace as well as 2 Olive Street. The proposals therefore fail to comply with Policy LP24 of the Kirklees Local Plan (b) in terms of the amenities of neighbouring properties and Paragraph 130 (f) of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Landscape issues

- 10.29 Apart from a small green roof serving as a roof terrace, no further landscaping is proposed.

Housing issues

- 10.30 The building serves as a business property following Change of Use from Dwelling to Office. There are no Housing Issues to address.

Highway issues

- 10.31 Policies LP21 and LP22 of the Kirklees Local Plan and the Council's adopted Highway Design Guide relate to access and highway safety as well as parking standards and are considered to be relevant to the consideration of this application.

- 10.32 The proposals would result in some intensification of the business/commercial use. However, the proposed development would be in a sustainable location well supported by public transport and therefore is not considered to have detrimental impact on access and highway safety / parking provision and is concluded to accord with policies LP21 and LP22 of the Kirklees Local Plan and the Council's adopted Highway Design Guide.

Drainage issues

- 10.33 The building serves as a business property following Change of Use from Dwelling to Office. It is acknowledged that extending over the entirety of rear outside amenity space would introduce hardstanding/impermeable surfaces except for the area given over to the green roof terrace.

- 10.34 Drainage would otherwise be handled by connection to mains/other drainage routes.

Representations

- 10.35 No representations have been received from members of the public following publicity.

Planning obligations

- 10.36 No Planning Obligations are set out.

Other Matters

- 10.37 *Carbon Budget:* On 12th November 2019, the Council adopted a target for achieving 'net zero' carbon emissions by 2038, with an accompanying carbon budget set by the Tyndall Centre for Climate Change Research. National Planning Policy includes a requirement to promote carbon reduction and enhance resilience to climate change through the planning system and these principles have been incorporated into the formulation of Local Plan policies. The Local Plan predates the declaration of a climate emergency and the net zero carbon target. However, it includes a series of policies, which are used to assess the suitability of planning applications in the context of climate change. When determining planning applications, the Council will use the relevant Local Plan policies and guidance documents to embed the climate change agenda.

- 10.38 The proposal is cumulatively a large development to an existing former dwelling which proposes to develop all its remaining rear outside amenity space with a marginal area to be green roof which would not be sufficient to offer compensating drainage to the increased hard surfacing of the space. However, it would be located in a sustainable area supported by regular public transport links and be constructed of low carbon embodied material in natural stone. As such, no special measures were considered to be required in terms of the planning application with regards to carbon emissions particularly as there are controls in terms of Building Regulations which would need to be adhered to as part of the construction process.
- 10.39 *Coal Mining Legacy (land stability)*: LP53 of the Kirklees Local Plan and paragraphs 174 and 183 of the National Planning Policy Framework are relevant which seek to ensure that a site is suitable for its new use taking account of ground conditions and land instability, including from natural hazards or former activities such as mining, pollution arising from previous uses and any proposals for mitigation.
- 10.40 The site is within an area at risk of land stability issues as a result of former mining activity, the Coal Authority has therefore been consulted regarding this proposal and confirms they have no objection to the scheme provided that appropriate measures be undertaken as part of the construction of the development and that the measures are secured by condition upon any grant of permission. Subject to inclusion of the recommended condition the proposal is considered to be acceptable in terms of land stability.

11.0 CONCLUSION

- 11.1 This application to erect a two-storey rear extension which also comprises a single storey element with terrace above to 212 Bradford Road has been assessed against relevant policies in the development plan, the National Planning Policy Framework and other material considerations.
- 11.2 The proposed development is considered to have an unacceptable impact to the residential amenity of neighbouring occupiers and also an unacceptable visual impact to both the host property and the wider street scene which is contrary to the local plan and national planning policy as discussed within the 'Visual Amenity' and 'Residential Amenity' sections of this report.
- 11.3 Whilst the proposal would have a small-scale impact in terms of providing additional office space in an identified centre this factor in itself is not considered to constitute a material consideration that outweighs the conclusion the development is contrary to the local plan and national planning policy.
- 11.4 The NPPF has introduced a presumption in favour of sustainable development. The policies set out in the NPPF taken as a whole constitute the Government's view of what sustainable development means in practice. It is considered that the development proposals do not accord with the development plan and the adverse impacts of granting permission would significantly and demonstrably outweigh any benefits of the development when assessed against policies in the NPPF and other material consideration. It is considered that therefore the proposed development would not constitute sustainable development and is therefore recommended for refusal.

12.0 RECOMMENDATION: That permission be refused for the reasons set out at the beginning of this officer report.

Background Papers:

Application and history files.

[Link to application details](#)

Certificate of Ownership –Certificate A signed: