Assent Planning Consultancy Ltd
solving problems.....

PLANNING STATEMENT

ERECTION OF SIDE EXTENSION

AT

HOLME FARM

HOLT HEAD ROAD

SLAITHWAITE

HD7 5TU

MARCH 2023

Introduction

This Planning Statement has been prepared to support a planning application for a single storey pitched roof side extension at Holme Farm, Holt Head Road, Slaithwaite.

Planning history and context

This Statement has been provided to support an application for an amended side extension at the above dwelling.

The information provided takes into account a decision letter issued by the the SoS with reference to a previous scheme that was dismissed in March 2022 (APP/Z4718/D/21/3283207). It also takes into account a recently-issued Lawful Development Certificate for Proposed Development (2022/CL/93989/W) for a side extension under permitted development rights.

In summary, the scale of the side extension has been reduced from a two-storey extension at the appeal stage. In this regard, the Inspector found, at paragraph 5, that the appealed scheme "...would largely respect the scale and footprints of the existing outlining and side garage". However, the Inspector also found that the appealed scheme "...would result in the proposal overall appearing as a prominent feature which would fail to respect the proportions of the original building..." to such an extent that "...the original building would no longer appear dominant in size or appearance..."

The Inspector continued with an assessment of "openness" and concluded at paragraph 10 that "....having regard to the location of the site and the position of surrounding development, I conclude that *the*

harm to the Green Belt arising from loss of openness would be limited" (author's emphasis).

In "Other matters", the Inspector opined that the proposed scheme would "....improve the appearance of the property" which attracted "...*significant weight in favour of approving the proposal*" (author's emphasis).

Given the reading of the decision letter overall, it is considered that the key reason for the dismissal of the appeal was the appearance of the side extension as a prominent feature that would fail to respect the proportions of the original building.

A recent grant of a Lawful Development Certificate for Proposed Development indicated that, using permitted development rights, a side extension could be erected without the need for planning permission. This extension would have a footprint of 48 square metres and a height to the ridge of 4m.

The proposed scheme that is the subject of this application has a slightly increased ridge height of 5m from the ridge height of the permitted development scheme (4m). However, the footprint of the proposed scheme is only 32 square m, as opposed to 48 square m in the permitted development scheme (a reduction of 25%).

As such, it is considered that the overall impact on the slightly increased height of the ridge on the proposed scheme is offset by a reduction in its footprint when compared to what could rebuilt under permitted development rights.

In addition, the proposed side extension is now clearly visually subservient to the original building and accurately reflects the proportions of the original building as per the comments of the Inspector at the previous appeal.

Therefore, given that the proposed extension is considered to have no materially greater impact on the openness of the green belt than the extension that could be erected under permitted development rights, and that the other matters in the appealed decision being satisfied, it is considered that the proposed scheme should now be capable of approval subject to any necessary and reasonable conditions.