

PLANNING STATEMENT

ERECTION OF DWELLING ADJOINING 198 YEW TREE ROAD, BIRCHENCLIFFE, HUDDERSFIELD HD2 2EQ.

1.0 INTRODUCTION.

- 1.1 This application seeks full planning permission for a revised proposal following refusal by the Council for an earlier proposal under reference 2018/91672.
- 1.2 The proposal has been revised following careful consideration of both the reasons stated on the refusal notice as well as the contents of the Officers Report.

2.0 ISSUES.

- 2.1 Issues are addressed as set out in the three reasons for refusal as set out in the refusal notice.
- 2.2 Overdevelopment of the Site. The earlier proposal was considered to be cramped within the application site and unduly prominent within the street scene.
- 2.3 In response to further comment the proposal has been amended to a dormer type bungalow with two first floor bedrooms in the roof space with a dormer to the main bedroom at the rear. The gross floor space measured externally has accordingly reduced from 136 sq. m. to 115 sq. m. It is considered that the proposal sits comfortably within the application site area. Furthermore, because of the reduced width of the new dwelling, the overall ridge height is reduced such that it is lower than that of 198 rather than rising above it. Finally the proposed dwelling is to be set further away from No.198 because two parking spaces are to be provided in the intervening space. As such the proposal represents an acceptable development within the overall street scene.
- 2.4 Residential Amenity. The earlier proposal was considered to cause harm both to occupiers of neighbouring properties as well as occupants of the proposed dwelling by reason of scale, proximity to nearby dwellings and land and position of habitable room windows.
- 2.5 In response it will be noted that the frontage of the new dwelling is set on a line 21 m. from habitable room windows of the dwelling opposite so as to fully accord with Policy BE12 criteria i of the UDP with one habitable room window at ground floor.
- 2.6 So far as the impact on the occupiers of 198 Yew Tree Road are concerned, and specifically when viewing the proposal from the conservatory. Although the distance of 12m. as set out in Policy BE12 criteria ii is not achieved it should be noted that:-
 - From the Yew Tree Road facing and end windows of the conservatory at No. 198 the view will largely be in front of the blank gable wall of the new dwelling with one frosted window to the proposed bathroom, the gable of the new dwelling is set much further away from the conservatory than previously proposed given the introduction of two parking spaces in the intervening space.
 - The new dwelling is to be set at a significantly lower level.

- Having regard to the effect that the applicant lives at No. 198, it is considered that any concern about his loss of amenity should not be such as to raise concern such as to justify refusal of the application.
- 2.7 The final issue is that of the proximity to and overlooking of the land to the rear.
- 2.8 It will be noted on the submitted plan that a line has been drawn showing the line of the rear wall of the bungalow (196?) beyond No. 198. That dwelling overlooks the same area of public open space (Urban Greenspace) as shown in the UDP and the publication draft local plan. Given the allocation of the overlooked land it is considered that its development should not be contemplated until at least 2031, the end of the draft Local Plan period. As such, given that it was felt appropriate by the Council to relax the distance from the boundary requirement of 10.5 m as set out in UDP Policy BE12 iii re the bungalow at 196, it is felt that there is equally good reason to relax the distance requirement in this case; also Policy BE12 does of course accept exceptions to normal policy requirements.
- 2.9 Highway Safety. Concern was expressed with the refused scheme about sub-standard sight lines for vehicles exiting the private drive. Parking is proposed for two cars between the new house and No. 198, Cars parked perpendicular to the highway will be able to exit safely with adequate sight lines provided either side of the entrance/exit.

3.0 CONCLUSION.

- 3.1 On the basis of the above, following careful consideration of objections regarding the earlier application, it is considered that the further concerns raised have now been satisfactorily overcome and, accordingly, that planning permission should be granted.

Malcolm Sizer

Malcolm Sizer Planning Ltd.

September 2018

rev A 10.12.18 – amended with further comments from planning.