

PLANNING STATEMENT

incorporating

Design and Access and Heritage Statement

Proposed Erection of Garage and Gym/Office

at

145, Church Street, Netherthong

Holmfirth HD9 3EA.

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Planning permission and listed building consent are sought for additions at 145, Church Street, a newly built 3-storey stone dwelling.

1.2 The dwelling abuts 143, Church Street (Previously 141A) a Grade II listed weavers' cottage.

1.3 Planning permission (2016/91343) and listed building consent (2016/91344) were first granted in March 2017 to which various alterations have been approved.

2.0 THE APPLICATION.

2.1 This application for both planning permission and listed building consent seeks approval for further changes to the approved scheme. It comprises: -

- Joint application form and certificates.
- This statement including Appendices A and B
- Location Plan
- Plans 22:0193, AL02 Revision B, and AL01
- Climate Change Statement

3.0 RECENT HISTORY.

3.1 On 27 September 2023 the Council refused applications for planning permission (2023/92319) and listed building consent (2023/92320) for essentially the same

proposal as in the subject of these applications, together with the erection of a small canopy.

3.2 The same reason for refusal was given in respect of both applications.

3.3 Attached at Appendix A is a copy of Sebastian Pickles' (Kirklees Conservation and Design Officer) consultation response to the applications.

3.4 With a view to seeking to overcome the reasons for refusal guidance was sought from Katie Chow, the case officer. Her response of 4th October was as follows: -
"As outlined within the above application and allied app 2023/92320 – the principle of erecting an outbuilding/extension/addition at the host property is considered to be acceptable. However, there are a number of concerns, which I have outlined below as potential remedies to these issues:

- Removal of the timber canopy - whether an alternative material/design would be acceptable – this should be discussed with Conservation & Design officers as they believed the canopy as proposed did not reflect the vernacular of the area.
- In terms of garage/gym/office building – this is substantial in size and therefore would need to be significantly reduced by at least half the footprint. This should appear as a subservient addition to the host dwelling, which as submitted it did not. By reducing the length of the building this will allow some additional space around the structure, reducing the appearance of a cramped development.
- In addition, the flat sedum roof should be replaced with a shallow pitched roof finished in stone slate to match the host dwelling. The building should also be finished with natural stone. These amendments will help the proposed building to blend more seamlessly in this prominent location

If a resubmission can be provided which follows the principles of the above, it is likely that we could look to move the application forward with a recommendation of approval. "

4.0 THE APPLICATIONS

4.1 In response to the comments from Sebastian Pickles and Katie Chow amendments have been made to the proposals.

4.2 The proposed canopy over the side door has been deleted

4.3 Taking a lead specifically from the comments by Sebastian Pickles in the penultimate paragraph of his consultation response the garage now incorporates a stone slate roof to match that of the existing house and the height of the existing stone boundary wall is increased with the use of reclaimed stone rather than vertical timber.

5.0 ASSESSMENT

5.1 In respect of the concerns identified by Katie Chew in her email of 4th October the revised proposals do not reduce the size of the garage/gym/office building by at least half the footprint as requested for the following reasons.

5.2 Her concern is that the building should appear as a subservient addition to the host building, reducing the appearance of a cramped development.

5.3 She takes the view that the building as originally applied for would not be subservient to the host dwelling. I disagree. The host building is three storeys in height, what is proposed is single storey.

5.4 The building is to be located on one side of the plot rather than intruding into the existing garden directly behind the rear elevation of the host building.

5.5 The site area is approximately 415 sq. m. The house has a floor area of approximately 70 sq. m. and the proposal 56 sq. m. giving a combined floor area of approximately 130 sq. m., less than a third of the total site area. I do not consider in any way what is proposed can be described as a cramped development.

5.6 The double garage is proposed where 2 No. car parking spaces were required as part of the approval for the original house. To reduce the footprint of the building by at least half as she requires would mean that only a garage capable of accommodating one car would likely be accepted, logically located in the south-western corner of the plot. However, in front a further parking space would be needed to meet the base planning permission requirement. Surely the attractive side wall of a double garage is preferable in terms of the setting of the listed building and the conservation area than a parked car.

5.7 In terms of the public viewpoint, I would argue that garage doors rather than the present gates, together with a modest increase in height of the inner boundary wall alongside New Road will have no undue adverse impact on visual amenity and the character of the conservation area. It is felt that, in both visual and biodiversity terms it is appropriate to retain a flat roof to the office gym. Visually, the elevation to New Road will appear essentially as a modest upward projection of the existing inner boundary wall rather than part and parcel of the proposed garage. To incorporate a pitched roof in the office /gym would mean that it would be allied visually with the proposed garage failing to address the concern about the bulk of the overall development.

5.8 There is one final point to be made in terms of visual impact. I attach at Appendix B an extract of O.S sheet scale 1:10,000 published in 1956, it shows what is understood to have been a substantial barn situated alongside New Road to its junction with Church Street. Isn't there merit in a more modest way replicating the historic tighter form of development?

5.9 I now deal with the proposed office/gym, Mr. Thorpe has set out the following.

"The garden room/office is for myself and my wife, Emma to both work at home. The house approval was done so before things changed significantly with covid and as such, we both have to work together in the same living room we always live in. Rather than travelling to work and for the privacy of each of our respective businesses (and the sanity of actually leaving the building itself) an office would give us more work space, reduce travel, congestion and unwarranted journeys, reduce pollution and provide a nicer home environment. I trust you will understand and accept the context of the proposal.'

5.10 I would finally wish to make the point that Sebastian Pickles' comment at Appendix A on the previous applications do not raise objection to the garage per se, only that a clear and convincing justification is required. He accepts that it would not significantly harm the setting of the listed dwelling at 143 Church Street or of the listed Church. He does however have concerns regarding impact on the Conservation Area. As noted earlier the charges in terms of the impact on the Conservation Area are modest – a replacement of the present gates with 2 No. garage doors and a gable end to the garage will be seen directly from Church Street and from the upper part of New Road there will be a modest increase in the height of the inner boundary wall together with a limited view of the now proposed stone clad pitch of the roof to the garage. I consider that their impacts will have no undue harm on the character of the conservation area and as such the requirement set out in Paragraph 194 of the NPPF is met.

6.0 CONCLUSION

6.1_The proposals now submitted have sought to address the concerns of the Council as set out in the decision notices issued on the previous scheme as well as the correspondence by Officers.

It is considered that those concerns have now been met and that as such approval should be forthcoming.

Malcolm Sizer

Malcolm Sizer Planning Ltd.

November 2023