About the application
Application number: 2022/94118
What is the application for?: External and internal alterations to convert one dwelling into two dwellings
Address of the site or building: 2-4, Lumb Lane, Almondbury, Huddersfield, HD4 6SS
Postcode: HD4 6SS

The following planning policies are relevant to the application:

- Policy LP21 Highways and Access
- Policy LP24 Design
- Policy LP28 Drainage
- Policy LP30 Biodiversity & Geodiversity
- Policy LP32 Landscape
- Policy LP58 Garden extensions

Policy LP21 states that 'Proposals shall demonstrate adequate information and mitigation measures to avoid a detrimental impact on highway safety...'

Comment: There is insufficient information on drawing P06/P Proposed Parking Options to enable the LPA to consider the proposals. There are no levels shown on the drawing, suggesting that the site is flat, when there is in fact a 1.2/1.5m level change between the highway and the gardens to the front of the properties. Cars will have to reverse into or out of the driveway as there is insufficient space to turn, which will pose a danger so close to the junction.

Policy LP24 states 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, heritage assets and landscape.'

Policy LP32 states that 'Proposals should be designed to take into account and seek to enhance the landscape character of the area considering in particular the setting of settlements and buildings within the landscape.'

Comment: Lumb Lane is within the green belt and the boundaries between properties are generally in the form of low dry stone walling and/or hedges. Timber fences do not typically feature, and where they do, they are less than 1.2m in height and are complemented by planting.
The proposed 1.6m closed board fencing is completely inappropriate as a boundary

treatment to the front of the property and would have a detrimental impact on the rural character of the area and the openness of the green belt. Its impact would be exacerbated by the elevated nature of the garden, meaning that the top of the fence would be almost 3m above the highway.
There will need to be retaining walls along the property boundaries to retain the higher ground to No. 6 and No. 2 and we would request that these are faced in second hand natural stone.

Policy LP30 stipulates that 'Development proposals will be required to minimise impact on biodiversity and provide net biodiversity gains through good design.' The proposals involve the loss of a mature garden with trees and planting which support nesting birds and no mitigation appears to have been made for this loss of habitat.
The loss of the garden and the introduction of a large area of impermeable tarmacadam will increase surface run-off from the site and the policy justification of Policy LP28 explains that 'When proposing new developments, surface water issues need to be addressed in terms of existing surface water and potential increases to run-off resulting from the development.'

Comment: Although the rear garden of No.4 is currently used as garden, it does extend beyond the original domestic curtilage and should therefore be considered under Policy LP58, which states that 'consideration should be given to the degree, location and orientation of the enclosure, which should cause least harm to the openness of the Green Belt; and that the means of enclosure is appropriate to its setting and is of a high quality of materials and design.'
The proposed 1.8m closed board fencing is considered to be inappropriate to the rural setting and would have a detrimental impact on the openness of the Green Belt. We believe that estate or agricultural fencing, or dry stone walling would be a more appropriate boundary treatment in the context of the green belt.