

Planning Application 2023/62/92230/W

In addition to the joint submission by the residents of Greenlea Court regarding this proposal, I wish to make some further individual comments.

When the original application to extend 5A Greenway was made in 2019 there was no supplementary planning guidance in place. However, we now have the House Extensions and Alterations SPD (June 2021), and I will base my initial comments on the proposal in relation to this before moving on to other matters. Although none of us living in the Court are planning professionals, I feel it is valid for us to offer our comments in relation to the guidance available.

LP24 Design a

the form, scale, layout and details of all development respects and enhances the character of the townscape, heritage assets and landscape;

The proposal is of a scale that would have a significant impact on the feel and character of Greenlea Court and Greenway. Raising the roof level as intended would create a property that would overpower the current open access to Greenlea Court and overlook the neighbouring properties. Greenlea Court was originally designed to have an open aspect, and this proposal would substantially alter that, when viewed from both within the Court and from Greenway.

LP24 Design b

they provide a high standard of amenity for future and neighbouring occupiers;

The proposed extension would use a significant area of the plot to squeeze a very large, four-bedroomed house into an area that is not large enough to accommodate it. Most of the rear garden would be lost, and the front garden area is small and not private. The proposals might suit the needs of the current owner in his current circumstances, but they would not suit future occupiers seeking a house of this size with its expected amenities.

LP Design c

extensions are subservient to the original building, are in keeping with the existing buildings in terms of scale, materials and details and minimise impact on residential amenity of future and neighbouring occupiers;

The scale of the proposal is not in keeping with the original building through its raising of the roof line at both the front and the rear. It is not subservient to the original building but radically changes the appearance and scale.

LP Design f

the needs of a range of different users are met, including disabled people, older people and families with small children to create accessible and inclusive places;

The proposals do not meet the needs of future occupiers with small children, through the utilisation of the rear garden for building the extension. The front garden would not be a safe alternative play space for children as Greenway is a busy road.

Key design principle 1: Local character and street scene

Extensions and alterations to residential properties should be in keeping with the appearance scale design and local character of the area and the street scene.

Please see my previous comments regarding the scale of the proposals. This issue is also comprehensively addressed in our joint submission.

4.5

Proposals for extensions should normally be smaller in scale than the original property and set back from the existing building line.

Again, the proposal is not smaller in scale than the original property but conversely aims to increase the scale of the property by raising the roof line at the front and rear.

Key design principle 3: Privacy

Extensions and alterations should be designed to achieve reasonable levels of privacy for both inhabitants, future occupants and neighbours.

4.8 *A reasonable amount of space should be provided around new extensions in the interests of the amenity of future residents and to prevent overlooking and undue loss of privacy to any existing residents,*

The drawings for the proposal show a sun room that will be very close to the side and rear boundaries of 5A Greenway. The design is cramped and cannot be said to meet the needs of future residents. Currently there is a high hedge to the rear of the property and the outlook of the sun room is directly onto this hedge. In my view this would negate the intended purpose of the room. The only way of achieving this would be to remove the hedge, but this is prohibited within the SPD and the planning application states that the trees forming the hedge will not be removed. So while the sun room would be private, it cannot provide the intended amenity.

4.10 *In general, a minimum separation distance of no less than 21 metres is recommended between facing windows of habitable rooms*

The distance from the lounge side window at 4 Greenlea Court to the perimeter wall of 5A Greenway is approximately 16.5m. It is impossible to calculate accurately from the drawings submitted, but it is highly likely that the rear elevation of the proposed building, and therefore the rear upstairs window above the sun room, is not more than 21m from the lounge window of 4 Greenlea Court, and therefore does not meet the planning guidelines. **This distance should be accurately measured by planning officers before any decision on the application is made.**

Key design principle 6: Preventing overbearing impact

Extensions and alterations should not unduly reduce the outlook from a neighbouring property.

The raising of the roof line of the property to all elevations will create a significant and overbearing impact on the approach, entry and exit to Greenlea Court. Approaching the court along Greenway from Green Cliff, the property would become a large block-like structure overlooking the driveway into the court. The current impression of openness of approach would be completely altered to a detrimental effect. The outlook for the occupants of ? Greenway opposite would also be adversely affected.

Key design principle 7: Outdoor space

Extensions and alterations should ensure an appropriately sized and useable area of private outdoor space is retained. Normally at least half the garden area should be retained as part of the proposals.

The proposed extension will reduce the already small rear garden. The private outdoor space remaining is of an inappropriate size to support a family of a size to live in a four-bedroomed house.

Key design principle 13: Vegetation and tree planting

Extensions and alterations should seek to retain existing vegetation and trees and enhance this provision through landscaping where possible.

The proposal indicates that the existing trees will be retained. However, it is difficult to envisage how the work to the property could be undertaken without removing them. Should this be the case, the application gives no indication of what would replace them to provide the necessary privacy for the occupiers and the residents of Greenlea Court.

Key design principle 15: Provision for parking

Extensions and alterations should maintain appropriate access and off-street 'in curtilage' parking.

4+ bedroom dwellings provide 3 off-street parking spaces

It is impossible for the proposals to meet this requirement. Currently, the property has one off street parking space to the front. To the rear is a turning area that is for the benefit of all residents and visitors of Greenlea Court. There is no parking space for the property in this area. This turning circle must be retained for the convenience and safety of everyone coming in and out of Greenlea Court. The court is very busy these days with residents' cars and delivery drivers. Large vehicles are in and out of the court on a regular basis. Compromising the designated turning area would be unsafe. The only way the parking requirement can be met for the proposed property is to create two additional parking spaces in the front garden. Even if this were physically possible, it would reduce the property's outdoor space by more than that required by the SPD. It would severely compromise the outdoor space, particularly bearing in mind the needs of future occupiers. In addition, to do this would drastically alter the visual impact of the property on Greenway.

The difficulties involved in meeting the parking requirement encapsulate the problems with the proposal as a whole, which tries to create a large, detached four-bedroomed house on a plot that is demonstrably inadequate for the purpose, and which would be unable to provide the space and amenities that future occupiers of such a property would expect, and could easily find elsewhere in Honley. The current owner may be content to live with these restrictions, but the proposal is not sustainable for the future long-term.

General Comments

In addition to my observations regarding the actual proposals, I am extremely concerned about the level of potential disruption of such works should the proposal be approved. Given the scale of what is intended it is difficult to envisage how materials could be stored. The entrance road to the Court is narrow and vehicles cannot be parked there or materials placed without causing severe obstruction. It is not possible to use the turning circle to the rear. All access would have to be from the

front of the property. Nevertheless, should the surface of the Court be damaged by construction traffic, there would need to be an agreement regarding the responsibility for repair and reinstatement, as this is currently shared between residents. As I have previously stated, I cannot see how the works could be undertaken without removing the trees to the rear of the property.

Greenlea Court itself is a small and settled community of long-standing residents. It is extremely disappointing that the owner of 5A Greenway continues to submit these very substantial proposals without any direct consultation with his future neighbours. Honley as a village is expanding with a considerable amount of new build homes. Many of these are four bedroomed detached houses which would provide suitable accommodation for the owner of 5A Greenway. There is perfectly adequate housing to meet his requirements, and better, elsewhere in the village, and no demonstrable need to alter this home, and therefore the streetscape of this part of the Honley Conservation Area.

3 Greenlea Court