

MALCOLM SIZER PLANNING LIMITED
CHARTERED TOWN PLANNERS

9 GREENFINCH GROVE
NETHERTON
HUDDERSFIELD HD4 7LH

TEL: 01484 667222
Mobile: 07595 630460
Email: malcolmsizer@hotmail.com

William Simcock
Planning Officer
Kirklees M. C. Planning Services
Civic Centre III
Market Street
Huddersfield
HD1 2JR

25 July 2017

Dear William,

Erection of 2-storey side extension to form enlarged Class A1 shop at ground floor with
residential flat above at 12B Hilhouse Lane, Fartown HD1 6EF
– Colne Valley Design
Application reference 2017/62/91132.

Further to our telephone conversation yesterday I confirm that I am assisting the applicant in respect of the above application.

I am in receipt of copies of your earlier correspondence with Mr. Mitchell, especially noting the contents of the second paragraph of your email of 15 May in which you set out your concern about impact on the street scene. I also note the opening sentence of your email of 22 May in which you state that you cannot recommend the proposal for approval for the reasons set out earlier.

Before dealing with that issue I note from our conversation that, notwithstanding the contents of the consultation reply from KMC Highways dated 12 April, you would not raise objection to the proposal from a highways point of view if the concern about impact on the street scene can be overcome.

Dealing now with your concern about the impact of the proposal on the street scene set out in your email of 15 May you acknowledge the extant approval (application reference 2014/93209) for an extension extending the existing building at 12B Hillhouse Lane right up to (not close to as stated in your email) the back edge of the pavement along Bradford Road.

That extension comprises two storeys with a gable facing onto Bradford Road.

The current application seeks to largely fill the current gap in the frontage between the site of the approved extension and the side wall of the building at 141 Bradford Road.

That building at 141 Bradford Road comprises a shop at pavement level with first floor

accommodation set well above with a gable terminating the frontage to Bradford Road. There is no other attached building on the Bradford Road frontage to its southern side.

The proposed extension is also to be two storeys in height with its eaves to the Bradford Road frontage and with its roof pitching back to a ridge at the same height as the ridge already approved.

The land on which the extension is proposed comprises an open area of what can only be described as wasteland in clear open view to passers-by on Bradford Road. It comprises rough grassland which has frequently suffered from the deposit of litter. It is therefore something of an eyesore which has been the subject of complaint by the Council to the owner. Work to tidy the site has been undertaken but it remains a continuing problem.

I would ask you to consider the following points:-

- As seen from across Bradford Road, the existing building at 141 appears as an isolated and prominent feature. The approved extension (2014/93209) will have the same effect.
- It is considered that the extension now proposed will have a softening effect on the visual impact of the isolated building at 141 and the already approved extension at 12B by effectively linking the two buildings at a lower height than the existing gables and removing the gap within the frontage.
- In your email of 15 May you state that, '... this new scheme ... could look out of place and overbearing in an area in which most commercial properties are of domestic scale and set back from the highway frontage'.
- I would disagree. The approved scheme includes a gabled frontage to Bradford Road which could be regarded as overbearing given its overall height and isolation from other properties on Bradford Road. The proposed extension will to a certain extent merge that extension into the wider street scene because the whole will have a close relationship linked to 141 Bradford Road.
- It is fully accepted that most commercial properties on Bradford Road are 2 storeys in height and of domestic scale. However that will not be the situation with the extension already approved because of the necessary underbuilding.
- It is logical to construct the proposed extension by relating it visually in the most appropriate way to the existing already approved. This is what is achieved by consistent floor, window and eaves heights.
- Finally, as noted above, the site has been the subject of complaint because of its untidiness and problem with litter. Implementation of the proposal will remove that problem to the significant benefit of the visual amenity of the area.

In conclusion I would ask you to carefully consider the points made and see fit to recommend approval of the application. If however you or your senior officer are of the view that permission should be refused then please withhold making a decision to enable my client to approach a local ward councilor with a view to having the application called up to a meeting of the Planning Sub-Committee (Huddersfield Area).

Please advise me of your intention.

Yours sincerely,

(Malcolm Sizer)