

KIRKLEES METROPOLITAN COUNCIL

PLANNING SERVICE

UPDATE OF LIST OF PLANNING APPLICATIONS TO BE DECIDED BY

STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE

10 AUGUST 2017

Planning Application 2017/91623

Item 12 – Page 27

Erection of 59 dwellings and associated means of access

Land at, Dunford Road, Hade Edge, Holmfirth, HD9 2RT

Amended Plans

A revised layout plan and an additional landscape plan have been submitted.

The revised layout plan has omitted 1 no dwelling which has improved some of the relationships between the proposed dwellings, the proposed number of dwellings is now 58. Officers consider however that whilst the majority of the site layout is acceptable further improvements could have been made to the south-eastern corner of the site which retains a cramped layout in parts. Applicants were requested to increase the space separation between dwellings and the boundaries of the site either by reducing the footprint of the units or by further reduction in numbers. The applicants have decided not to undertake further amendments beyond that recently undertaken. Taking a balanced view of the layout and the harm arising from not making further changes officers are of the opinion that on the whole this scheme is acceptable. There is also concern that the access way to the rear of plots 1-11 which proposes close boarded fencing either side does not achieve an attractive approach or natural surveillance. Whilst this is not ideal this is one small part of the development that is generally acceptable and not in itself a reason to refuse the application.

The planting scheme includes some tree and hedge planting, however landscape officers considered that the scheme did not go far enough in terms of mitigative planting in order to integrate the proposed urban nature of the development into the rural village landscape. This is particularly important considering the prominent nature of the site and the extent of development in relation to the existing village of Hade Edge. A landscaping condition is proposed and over time the landscaping will assist in reducing the overall impact of the development particularly when viewed from distance. The types and species of planting can be agreed through the condition discharge phase and is a matter of detail rather than principle.

Additional Information

A Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment has been received. A summary of the comments of the Council's Landscape architect are included below.

Assessment

The report identifies the site as lying within local landscape character type D 'Moorland Fringes/Upland pastures' and within landscape character D7 Low Common, Royd Moor and Whitley Common. This is incorrect and should be D7 Peak Fringe Upland Pastures.

The report's Landscape Baseline assesses the site as being in a moderate condition and having a moderate landscape value. The Council's Landscape Architect notes the site has character and value as a local working landscape and part of the village plan. It has features worthy of conservation; a defined sense of place and some detracting features. The assessment of moderate is considered to be fair.

The report addresses the magnitude of the landscape effects upon the receptors in particular the effect on the North Peak District fringe the border of which is 1 Km to the south. The sensitivity of the landscape character is considered to be Medium. There will be more impact at a local level but the site will be seen from some medium and long distance views that are not the peak district edge; the impact is subjective and will depend on the design mitigation used to blend the development into the landscape.

The report states the magnitude of effects on landscape character is small; and the extent of the landscape change would be localised and confined to the immediate setting due to the existing vegetation and varied natural topography. It goes on to say the effect on the landscape character will be slight, bringing some change to the landscape and would not constitute an adverse landscape effect or significant environmental effect' The Council's Landscape architect considers the development will have an impact greater, and will be a matter of how well the impact can be mitigated by design and planting. The proposal will have a medium landscape impact.

The susceptibility and sensitivity of neighbouring residential visual receptors is considered to be High. The value of the receptors in close proximity such as on Dunford Road and Greave Road are considered to be High and at further distances, for example individual properties at Flight Road, Medium. The value of the view is judged because of the relatively moderate scale of the proposed development and intervening vegetation on the varied topography.

Assessment of Visual Effects on the Peak District National Park

The Peak District Boundary is 1 Km south of the proposed site. Hade Edge sits on a lower Pennine plateau and the landscape rises to the edge of the higher plateau where the boundary line is along Bare Bones Road. It is agreed that the views from the Park boundary would be deemed to be of High sensitivity but actual magnitude of change would be assessed as Moderate from the viewpoints where the site can be seen and will have a slight effect on the National Park as a whole.

Landscape Strategy

The landscape plan shows planting to the west boundary only along Dunford Road, there is no other planting except for sections of beech or hornbeam hedgerow and a few random trees on the east boundary; this does not form

any screen or filter of views. There are trees proposed for mostly front gardens; there are no rear garden trees which would form the screening and mitigation to outward views. There are no street trees. Hedgerows and supplementary planting do not flow together or join up to form biodiversity connectivity, there are no areas of planting dedicated to biodiversity or wildlife, there is no suggestion of this in the planting plan; there is no hint of how this landscape planting plan assimilates into the wider context; there is no consideration of the upland landscape, its micro-climates or local flora and fauna.

Overall Conclusions

The site should be seen as characteristic and valuable as part of the local landscape and although within it is seen as moderate or of medium importance and should accept capacity to change, it needs to change within the context of the locality; it still requires to be part of the local landscape and the landscape plan does not express this. There is no consistency with existing areas of vegetation; there is no clear screening; there is no evidence of improved biodiversity and it is hard to understand what reinforces the landscape character of the locality. A correct landscape plan that pays some respect to the locality; that screens and mitigates views; that seeks to integrate with the locality and provides opportunities for nature and biodiversity would affect the necessary positive change that is required and negate any concerns over moderate effects.

The shortfalls with regard to the more comprehensive landscaping and less urban layout needs to be balanced against the positives of providing 58 dwellings in an area that is considered to be sustainable within and is preferential flood risk perspective. These positives and the economic benefits to the economy at a time when the council do not have a 5 year housing supply are considered to outweigh the other identified elements.

Consultations

Comments are awaited from the Peak Park Authority.

The Local Authority has submitted a Habitats Regulation Assessment to Natural England. The comments from Natural England are awaited.

Draft Section 106 Agreement

The applicants have provided a draft Section 106 agreement. The applicant has agreed to provide the following contributions:

- (i) secure the provision of 20 % of total number of dwellings as Affordable Housing on the Site;
- (ii) secure the payment of the Public Open Space Contribution in the sum of £256,474
- (iii) secure the payment of the Education Contribution in the sum of £250,400; and

- (iv) secure the payment of the sum of £31,762.50 towards Travel Plan measures.

Representations

The Hade Edge Community Group has submitted a number of questions to officers and the applicant. The questions are detailed below, together with the responses from officers, and a separate response from the applicant.

- Are the observations made towards the current character and design of Hade Edge correct? Could Kirklees have a tainted or unrealistic view? We would urge the officers who look at the design and character to take a closer look at our village and take more account of the current character and feel.

Response: Officers negotiated with the applicant to secure the best possible design and layout and more extensive mitigative planting. The applicants provided some of the requirements and given the benefits of the provision of housing the scheme is considered on the whole to be acceptable.

- Notwithstanding the fact that 100% of the village is constructed from natural stone and the houses in close proximity to the location of the proposed development are constructed from quality natural sand stone, why would a design including render and artificial stone be considered appropriate?

Response: Officers have advised the applicant that the use of natural stone will be acceptable. The use of render and artificial stone is not appropriate in the sensitive areas of the site however the further into the centre of the site where it is less visible limited use of these materials would be acceptable and their impact would be limited on wider views.

- Concerns have been raised regarding the huge visual impact the development will have from other parts of the valley due to its size and design. It is also encroaching on the views and environment of the National Park. Why have Kirklees not considered or suggested alternative layouts which do not impact in the same way?

Response: Officers have negotiated with the applicant to secure improvements to the design of the layout and more extensive mitigative planting. The proposal as it stands is as far as the applicants have been prepared to provide. The layout is not considered to justify refusal of planning permission.

- When considering the issues with the layouts of other estates in Hade Edge; have Kirklees or Jones Homes looked at the possibility of providing two points of access for vehicles onto Dunford Road?

Response: Officers have assessed the proposal submitted which is for one access point onto Dunford Road and two points are access would not be required or justified for a development of this scale.

- Not once has the impact the proposed development will have on us the current residents of Hade Edge been considered. How can the Council officers be so far at odds from the views and feeling of the local residents? Are you aware of the strength of feeling within the village?

Response: Officers have taken into account all representations submitted.

- “The proposals submitted within the Design & Access Statement illustrate development which is entirely at odds with both the local landscape and traditional vernacular of Hade Edge. It is possible that good design could begin to alleviate some of the issues of design congruency” (Stephenson Halliday). Why has good design and proposals which will enhance the landscape not been insisted on by Kirklees rather than accepting the low quality design from Jones Homes?

Response: Officers have negotiated with the applicant to secure improvements to the design of the layout and more extensive mitigative planting. The proposal as it stands is as far as the applicants have been prepared to provide. The layout is not considered to justify refusal of planning permission

The layout shows the houses to be very close together with little space between". We agree with the comment from the Council's Streetscene and Housing Landscape so how do Jones Homes and officers justify that density and layout are acceptable?

- **Response:** The density of the development is not significantly dissimilar to that found elsewhere in the village. Officers secured the removal of one plot which has opened up the space within the site to a degree. Further amendments would be desirable reflecting the comments of officers and those of the local community but the layout is at a point where refusal on grounds of poor design would be difficult to substantiate.

The applicant has made the following comments:

Public Consultation: The HECG representation raises concerns over the perceived lack of engagement with the community. We would respond that both the outline application and this submission have been subject to public consultation and we have complied with local and national planning guidance in this respect. Approximately 175 local houses were subject to a leaflet drop, inviting comments and suggestions in respect of the proposals.

Receipt of responses from 43 households indicates a wide awareness of the proposals. Unfortunately, a significant proportion of respondents (as detailed in the Statement of Community Involvement) chose not to engage with the majority of the questionnaire.

In addition to the application consultation processes, the site has been subject to widespread public consultation through the lengthy Local Plan process.

Materials: We are proposing a mix of materials to ensure visual interest in the development. Although the site is not within a Conservation Area, natural stone is proposed to the plots fronting onto Dunford Road and close to the listed Chapel. Artificial stone also represents a sustainable resource. Taking these factors into account, we consider that an appropriate mix of materials is proposed.

Access points: No objections have been raised by Highway Officers in respect of the provision of a single access point - this is typical of a development of this size and it is unclear what benefits a second access would bring in terms of highway safety. Furthermore, a second access point would reduce the efficiency of the use of the land, by reducing the number of dwellings achievable on the site.

Layout/density: As set out in detail in the Planning Statement, the proposed development has been reduced in terms of number of dwellings (down to 59). The proposed density is 23.6 dwellings per hectare, which is below the 30 dwellings per hectare minimum which the draft Local Plan policy DLP6 requires. It also compares favourably (in terms of being low density) with existing development in the village of Hade Edge. Nevertheless, in response to Officers' comments, the spacing between plots 33-37 has been revisited. This has resulted in amended plans being submitted with alterations to house types which increases spacing between these properties. The proposed number of units also enables Jones |Homes to offer full Section 106 contributions, including the delivery of 12 affordable homes - a reduced number of dwellings could impact on this position.

An additional representation has also been received from the Hade Edge Community Group regarding biodiversity. The Council's ecologist has made the following comments:

- It is clear that the HEFF group object to the development of the site and have researched relevant policy and legislation that supports this objection. Much of the cited policies appear relevant, but not necessarily in respect of biodiversity.
 - I have only summarised the objection and identify specific policies that may need further assessment.
 - With regards to HRA, the letter seems to claim that the Local Plan HRA is not legally compliant, and that no project level HRA has been undertaken. The objection letter does not demonstrate a complete understanding of the purpose of or process requirements of Habitat Regulations Assessment. The letter is premature in claiming that no project level HRA has been undertaken, and the Local Plan HRA is considered by Kirklees Council to be legally compliant.
-

Outline application for residential development and convenience store, and provision of open space

Land at, Dunford Road, Hade Edge, Holmfirth, HD9 2RT

Red Line Boundary

The red line boundary in the committee report includes an area of land within the green belt. In the interests of clarity this has been omitted from the proposed application.

Representations

In so far as the concerns raised by residents have not been previously addressed:

Infilling this open land would result in the loss of this attractive landscaping setting and replace it with views of modern houses in a suburban housing estate.

Response: The proposed layout is indicative, however it is considered that the significant improvements could be made at reserved matter stage with respect to the number and layout of the dwellings.

The development would result in harm to open views from publically accessible points within the National Park and to views from Hade Edge to the National Park.

Response: The proposed layout is indicative and this is a matter which would be considered as reserved matters,

The site should be considered as a 'valued landscape' in terms of paragraph 109 of the NPPF and warrants protection.

Response: The site is not considered to be an elevated landscape within the meaning of paragraph 109 of the NPPF.

Concern the proposal will swamp the village. 66 houses are being shoehorned into an area that is occupied by 23 or 24 houses on the other side of Dunford Road.

Response: The proposed layout is indicative and this is a matter which would be considered as reserved matters,

Concern about the impact due to the proximity to a Turkey and Poultry Farm. This is a source of noise and gives rise to the potential for conflict and disturbance.

Response: Environmental Services have considered this matter but due to the distance of the proposed development to the Turkey Farm do not consider the proposal would have any detrimental impact on future residents. The viability of the Turkey Farm would therefore be unaffected.

The retail unit with the scheme is intended to provide some compensation for the poor sustainability credentials of the site. The store is too small to be viable. Little weight can be attached to the shop as a beneficial part of the proposal.

Response: The proposed shop is not considered to be fundamental to the overall sustainability of the proposed scheme.

It would be a detriment to the Junior and Infant school that are struggling for spaces for local children. Transport to Holmfirth High School would additionally add a costly overhead.

Response: In line with the requirements of 'Providing for Education Needs Generated by New Housing' (KMC Policy Guidance), the proposed development attracts a contribution towards additional School Places it would generate. In order to satisfy a shortfall in additional school places generated by the development, an education contribution of £250,400 is required. The applicant has agreed to pay the full requirement.

There is no need for this kind of open market housing development in the village. The highest priority in the Kirklees area is for 1 and 2 bedroom affordable starter homes.

Response: The Council cannot demonstrate a five year housing supply. In these circumstances the proposal for housing is given significant weight.

Frequent interruptions to electric and water supply.

Response: This matter is noted but it is not a reason to refuse the application.

Holme Valley Parish Council object to the application due to concerns raised about the impact on rural community, the lack of infrastructure, sewerage and public transport. They consider development is not sustainable in this location and this site should be retained as safeguarded land. There are also concerned about the over-intensification within a rural Greenfield site and that Hade Edge is more suitable for organic growth and would support a smaller, better mix of housing (including more one or two bedroom properties, affordable housing, and properties for first time buyers and the elderly).

Response: The Council's stance on the principle of development is set out in the committee report. The application is an outline application however is it is considered a scheme could be brought forward at reserved matter stage which would preserve the landscape character of the area.

Holme Valley Parish Council have also raised concerns about access and insufficient onsite parking, that there is no alternative parking on Dunford Road or Sheffield Road which are already congested and could not cope with the additional vehicles generated from this proposed development.

Response: Highways DM have assessed the proposal and do not object to the scheme subject to conditions and a financial contribution towards a Travel Plan measures to assist in providing incentives to encourage the use of public transport and other sustainable travel modes.

Erection of training facility building with ancillary sports areas and demolition of existing pavilion

Woodfield Park Sports and Social Club, Meltham Road, Lockwood, Huddersfield, HD4 7BG

Additional Highway Condition:

Highway Services have suggested an additional condition requiring an access and car park management plan. The purpose of the condition is to control and manage traffic including any coaches on match days in the interests of highway safety.

14. Access and Car Park Management Plan

Outline application for erection of industrial development for B1 (business), B2 (general industry), and B8 (storage and distribution) uses

Station Road, Bradley, Huddersfield, HD2 1UT

Additional Highway Detail

Following additional consultation with the Council Highways DM service, concerns were raised regarding the pedestrian accessibility of the proposed development. In particular, the original plans did not show appropriate pedestrian access from the proposed access across the single lane bridge.

The plans have been amended and a new pedestrian button and pole and dropped kerb have been included. Highways DM have assessed the amended plan and consider it acceptable, particularly owing to the low level of pedestrian movements anticipated.

The proposal requires amendments to the existing traffic signal sequencing and the insertion of new traffic signals. Consequently, an **additional planning condition is recommended requiring the submission of a traffic signal scheme, phasing and monitoring plan.**

Outline application for residential development

Oak Mill, Cliff Hollins Lane, East Bierley, BD12 7ER

7.0 PUBLIC/LOCAL RESPONSE:

7.1 The application was advertised by site notice and neighbour notification letters.

7.2 5 letters of objection were received in addition to comments from Councillor Andrew Pinnock. The concerns raised are summarised below:

Highway safety/access/Traffic
Pedestrian safety
Visibility
Flood risk
Lack of school places & facilities
Land contamination

7.3 Councillor Andrew Pinnock's comments are summarised below:

- Generally OK with the plans.
- Highways is of some concern, because the site is adjacent to a narrow bridge and to some rather sharp bends. The whole of Cliff Hollins Lane (except for the first part at the Oakenshaw end) is narrow, including the bit at the site entrance, where there is also an access to the three houses at The Cringles.
- Not clear as to the usage of the site in recent years, so am not able to assess the impact of this new development.

Representations

10.32 Five representations, in addition to comments from Councillor Andrew Pinnock, have been received. In so far as they have not been addressed above:

Highway safety/access/Traffic

Response: The application has been fully assessed taking into account the improvements that the development would introduce. As such it is considered that the development would not result in any detrimental impact to highway safety.

Pedestrian safety

Response: The proposals include improvements to the access and highway including the provision of a footway. The development will therefore improve connectivity and highway safety for pedestrians.

Visibility

Response: The application has been fully assessed taking into account the improvements that the development would introduce that include to visibility. As such it is considered that the development would not result in any detrimental impact to highway safety.

Flood risk & drainage:

Response: The application is accompanied by a Flood Risk Assessment, Sequential and Exceptions test which are considered acceptable for the purposes of determine this application. The assessment demonstrates that the development will not lead to any further increase in flood risk in the area and shows that mitigation measures should lead to a decrease in risk.

Lack of school places & facilities

Response: The development is under the threshold for seeking contribution towards the provision of education.

Land contamination

Response: Environmental Health have commented on matters regarding land contamination and conditions are recommended to ensure the land would not pose risk to human health.

Additional Conditions

Details of the developable and undeveloped balance of the site will be submitted at Reserved Matters to accord with proposed site plan PL-003 Rev.

Any existing buildings/ structures located outside of the developable area shall be removed from the site and the land landscaped accordingly.

Reason: To improve the openness of the Green Belt and for the avoidance of doubt at Reserved matters stage.

Erection of new education building with the associated landscaping

University of Huddersfield, Queens Street South, Huddersfield.

Consultations

K.C. Strategic Drainage: Object to the proposal. The submitted Flood Risk Assessment includes partial out of date information, lacks sufficient information from flood risk from the canal (including mitigation) and requires further details on the proposed drainage.

Yorkshire Water: Object to the proposed development as insufficient information has been provided on the proposal's impact upon underground public water supply and sewerage infrastructure.

The applicant is reviewing K.C. Strategic Drainage and Yorkshire Water's comments with a view to respond accordingly. As the matter progresses members will be kept informed through the subsequent formal recommendation report.

Representations

Since the Officer's Report was published one public representation has been received. The following is a summary of the concerns raised.

- While the commenter has no specific objection to the proposal, concern is raised over the security impact, during construction and afterwards, upon the adjacent Huddersfield Drill Hall.

Response: Consultation is ongoing with the Police Architectural Liaison Officer and the Counter Terrorism Security Advisor. However neither of these groups will look specifically at the relationship with the Drill Hall. The case officer has requested that the University provide a statement on this matter, and open a dialogue with the Drill Hall. This is ongoing.
