

Kirklees Council
Planning Services.
Investment & Regeneration,
PO Box B93,
Civic Centre III,
Off Market Street,
Huddersfield,
HD1 2JR.

1 June 2023
Your ref:
Our Ref: 101 Briarlyn Rd. Garage resub

Dear Sir / Madam

Proposal: Erection of single storey garage extension (revised scheme).

Site: 101 Briarlyn Road, Birchenclyffe, HD3 3NW

Planning Portal Ref: PP-12205787

Introduction

On behalf of the applicant, Mr B Hogan, I hereby submit a householder planning application for a single storey garage extension to the side of 101 Briarlyn Road, Birchenclyffe.

This is a revised scheme comprising a smaller extension to address concerns raised in refusing the previous application – LPA ref 2023/62/90565/W.

The Site

101 Briarlyn Road is a semi-detached dwelling at the junction of Briarlyn Road and Briarlyn Avenue. It is brick built with a large parking area to the side.

The site and its surrounds are residential in character and appearance. The semi-detached dwellings along Briarlyn Road and Briarlyn Avenue have similar flat roof, single storey garages to the side. The fronts of these garages run flush with the main elevation of the host dwelling – the application site (and neighbour at #99) together with adjacent properties at 54/56 Briarlyn Avenue have flush garages as do the dwellings on the south side of Briarlyn Avenue opposite its junction with Briarlyn Road. Flush garages (as per photograph below – next page). This is a clear design feature of existing dwellings.

The proposed garage is for domestic use.

The site is not subject to any ecological, heritage and landscape designations.

There are no trees on site.

Example streetscene showing existing dwellings with single storey side garages flush with main elevation of the host dwelling – image is taken adjacent to 99 Briarlyn Road looking north towards similar dwellings along Briarlyn Avenue.



The Proposal – revised scheme

The proposal comprises removal of the container unit and construction of a simple, single storey garage extension to the side of the dwelling. The garage will be single storey and built in brick to match the host dwelling.

The planning application is a resubmission of previous scheme (LPA reference 2023/62/90565) – the proposed garage has been reduced in height and width with the garage door also reduced in size. The changes seek to address concerns raised in the officer report.

The width of the extension has been reduced from 6.33m to 5.87m (2/3 of width of host dwelling) with height now down to 2.7m to eaves (stated at 3.1m in officer report for previous scheme). The garage door has been reduced from 5m to 3m.

Copied below is the proposed front elevation of the refused scheme with the revised scheme set out below that – this enables a simple comparison of the two schemes – the changes in width, together with reduced size of garage door, are considered to address previous concerns. The reduced garage door size creates a brick area to the side (where the house number is shown) which assists in further reducing the mass of the extension.

Refused scheme – LPA ref 2023/62/90565



Proposed South West Elevation
101 Briarlyn Avenue

Proposed scheme – reduced width, height and garage door size



Proposed South West Elevation
101 Briarlyn Avenue

Planning Assessment

Having read the officer report for planning application 2023/62/90565, it is noted that there are no issues with highways or residential amenity.

The main issue was design with reference made to Local Plan policies LP2 and LP24 together with guidance set out in the House Extensions and Alterations SPD. In respect of the SPD, reference is made to paragraphs 4.5, 4.6 and 5.17.

Paragraph 5.17 of the SPD refers to the general rules, where single storey side extension should:

- not extend more than two thirds of the width of the original house;
- not exceed a height of 4 metres;
- and be set back at least 500mm from the original building line to allow for a visual break.

These 'general rules' should be considered in relation to text set out at paragraph 4.5 of the SPD which refers to the impact a scheme has specifically on the original house explaining that proposal should *normally* (my emphasis) be smaller in scale than the original property and set back from the existing building line. The SPD goes on to explain under paragraph 4.6 that where extensions seek to differ from the existing design and roof pitch (amongst other things) that proposals will be considered on a case by case basis.

Turning firstly to SPD para 5.17, the proposed extension is consistent with the first 2 bullet points in that it is no more than 2/3 the width of the dwelling (reduced width is 5.87m which is 2/3 of the 8.7m width of dwelling) and less than 4m in height. The issue relates to the 500mm set back. Given the location of the dwelling and the lack of a neighbour to the south, there is no need for a set back to create a visual break as there is no building to create a break with. The side extension will simply be seen in the context of the large side garden and existing boundary treatments whilst it will also not extend beyond the southern elevation of dwellings at 54 & 56 Briarlyn Avenue. The extension will not therefore be prominent, dominant or incongruous in the streetscene.

Referring to SPD paragraphs 4.5 and 4.6, it is noted that the SPD uses the word 'normally' rather than 'must' or 'should' (para 4.5) and that 4.6 refers to schemes being assessed on a case by case basis. There is therefore flexibility in the policy which is consistent with planning / development management principles and the assessment of each application on its merits. In this case there are clear grounds to allow a flush extension.

With this in mind, I refer back to the photographs above (and observations that can be made when visiting the site and its immediate surrounds) whereby it is clear that all existing dwellings around the site have side extensions that are flush with the main front elevation. This is an established design feature of these dwellings and is prevalent in the streetscene. As such there are clear grounds to support the proposal in this case. The flush design is in-keeping with surrounding dwellings and there is no basis or justification for any set back.

In light of the above, it is considered that the revised scheme comprising a narrower extension with smaller garage door and reduced height addresses the previous concerns / reason for refusal. The proposed extension will be subservient to the host dwelling and not incongruous in the streetscene. A flush extension is consistent with the design and appearance of existing 2 storey dwellings surrounding the site and as such there are no reasonable planning grounds to refuse this revised scheme.

The proposal is consistent with design guidance set out in the NPPF and complies with Local Plan policies LP2 and LP24 as well as guidance set out in the House Extension and Alterations SPD.

In light of the above we respectfully request the planning officers support the revised scheme and grant planning permission.

In the event officers have any queries or require further information we respectfully request they contact the agent or applicant to discuss in advance of making their decision.

I trust that you have all the information required to validate the application and would be grateful if you can please confirm safe receipt of the enclosed application. If you require anything further in the meantime, please do not hesitate to contact the undersigned.

Yours faithfully

Alistair Flatman (MRTPI)
Director
Alistair Flatman Planning Ltd

Enc –

Application Form
Plans –dwg DL800-01A