

Robert Halstead

Chartered Surveyors & Town Planners

N.C. Willock MRICS MRTPI

Office G of H, Bridge Mills, Huddersfield Road, Holmfirth, HD9 3TW

Tel: 01484 686322 e mail: nick@roberthalstead.co.uk

Planning Development

Planning Statement: 21-23, 25 and 27 Round Ings Road, Outlane, Huddersfield

Background and Summary

Robert Halstead Chartered Surveyors and Town Planners have been appointed to act as agents in connection with this site, which has seen two previously unsuccessful applications. A new firm of architects have also been appointed (Architecture and Design Partnership) who have considerable experience in producing sympathetic schemes with listed building and Green Belt settings.

A thorough review of all the issues raised by the Council and its consultees has been undertaken, and following a very positive response to the pre-application enquiry in Autumn 2023, we now submit the formal planning / listed building application. For ease of reference a List of Issues Addressed can be found at Appendix 1.

It is important to note that planning permission is not required for the re-occupation of the three existing dwellings – 21/23, 25 and 27, as they have been occupied in recent decades and do not fulfil the tests for 'abandonment'. Any planning application is therefore concerned solely with minor extensions to two of these dwellings, and the conversion of other buildings to form one additional dwelling.

In material planning terms therefore, the improvements to the facilities and amenities for the three existing dwellings (for example proposed highway safety improvements), in addition to the re-use of the attached barn for a beneficial long term purpose, and the rescue of the detached curtilage listed barn from impending collapse, are required to be balanced alongside all other material considerations in this case.

Our view is that the plans and supporting information have been revised and strengthened to a sufficient degree so that the planning balance is now clearly weighted in favour of granting planning permission and listed building consent. Through the pre-application enquiry process, the LPA appears to now agree (on a without prejudice basis) that this is the case.

Site Description

The application site comprises of a row of Grade II Listed two-storey terraces (nos. 21/23, 25 & 27) with an attached barn and a separate two-storey detached curtilage listed farm building. The buildings are constructed of hammer dressed stone with stone slate pitched roofs. Both the attached barn and detached farm building contain large round arched doors on the front elevations. The terraced cottages contain mullion style windows on the front and rear elevations.

Access to the site is via a driveway leading from Round Ings Road. The row of terraces is situated at right angles to the road with the curtilage farm building located at the north-eastern end of the site facing the road. There is currently a yard/gravelled area located directly south of the buildings and grassed areas directly north. The surrounding area comprises of scattered residential dwellings and open fields.

Recent Planning History

2022/92169 – Erection of extensions and alterations to 3 dwellings, change of use and extensions and alterations to form extended dwelling (no.4) and change of use of land to form access and parking (Listed Building) – Refused

2022/92170 – Listed Building Consent for erection of extensions and alterations to 3 dwellings, change of use and extensions and alterations to form extended dwelling (no.4) and change of use of land to form access and parking – Refused

2021/90207 – Erection of extensions and external alterations to existing dwellings and attached barn to form 4 dwellings; demolition of detached barn; erection of detached car port and change of use of land to form access and parking (Listed Building) – Withdrawn

2021/90208 – Listed Building Consent for erection of extensions and external alterations to existing dwellings and attached barn to form 4 dwellings; demolition of detached barn; erection of detached car port and change of use of land to form access and parking - Withdrawn

Policy Designation

The application site is located within the Green Belt in accordance with the Kirklees Local Plan Policies Map.

The Proposals

The proposals include the following works requiring either planning permission and / or Listed Building Consent:

- 1) Internal and external alterations to the three listed cottages, including new windows and doors. Single storey lean-to extensions to the rear of No's 25 and 27. The extensions would project out from the rear elevation by 3.2 metres and be set in on either side of the dwellings. The extensions would be constructed using matching materials (natural stone and slate) with simple glazed frontages (aluminium bi-fold doors).
- 2) Conversion of attached barn to form 1 no. dwelling, including a two storey extension to the side. The extension would project out by 5.4 metres and would be set in from the front and rear elevations. The roof of the extension would be pitched and set down from the roof on the original building. Window / door openings are proposed on the side and rear elevations. All materials are to match the existing (natural stone and slate).
- 3) Existing openings on the front and rear elevations of the attached barn to be simply glazed side hung casement windows with minimal frames. Two new / modified openings proposed on the rear elevation. Internal alterations include a new staircase and removal of sections of wall to provide access to the new extension and to form storage.

- 4) The existing detached barn is proposed to be partially dismantled, the stones would be numbered, and the barn would be re-built as existing, including the original openings and lime mortar pointing. One new window opening is proposed at first floor level on the north-east elevation and three conservation style rooflights are also proposed. The barn would then form additional two-storey accommodation for the proposed dwelling in what is now the attached barn. A single storey glazed link extension with a glazed pitched roof is proposed in order to connect the detached barn to the attached barn.
- 5) Replacement of doors and windows in the existing dwellings – agreed provisionally with Conservation & Design officers as follows:
 - a) Proposed sash windows are to replace the unauthorised double casements windows currently fitted (which are deemed to be inappropriate). The sashes are to be spring balanced, and double glazed units with traditional through glazing beads. These windows will be fitted to no. 21 / 23 (ground and first floor) and 25 & 27 (ground floor).
 - b) The recently fitted first floor double glazed casement windows to units 25 and 27 are proposed to be retained.
 - c) The installation of two conservation style rooflights in No's 25 and 27, one on the attached barn extension, and three on the detached barn.
 - d) Vertical timber doors with glazed vision panel on all dwellings (including the detached barn element).

NOTE: separate detailed drawings for window and door details accompany this application.

- 6) Existing porch building on No. 21-23 to be removed and replaced with a simple vertical boarded door. The existing garage door opening to be fitted with aluminium bi-fold doors.
- 7) The existing driveway is proposed to be widened to 4.5 metres (to allow two cars to pass) and would be constructed using tarmac. The private driveway area to the front of the dwellings is proposed to be surfaced with gravel. A refuse collection point and grit bin storage are proposed adjacent to the entrance to the development.
- 8) A turning head is proposed for fire tender and other cars / delivery vehicles. The entrance area is proposed to be widened to allow better pull-in for bin waggons.
- 9) Each dwelling is proposed to have an allocated parking plot to accommodate two or three cars (the minimum required according to the Kirklees Highway Design SPD according to bedroom numbers). These areas would be constructed using a grasscrete surface and bordered by a new stone retaining wall (other than the area for No. 21-23). One visitor parking space is also proposed.
- 10) Each dwelling is proposed to have its own private outdoor amenity space which will be bordered by a combination of 1.2m high dry stone walls and 1.2m high post and rail fencing. Each dwelling will also have its own refuse storage area.

Assessment of the Proposals

The following assessment focuses on the three previous reasons for refusal, however a more detailed breakdown of the issues previously raised is contained at Appendix 1 to this Planning Statement.

The current scheme also reflects discussions held as part of the recent pre-application enquiry.

Green Belt

Five reasons for refusal were given by the LPA on the previous application (ref: 2022/92169). The first reason which relates to the Green Belt, states the following:

'1. The application site is located within the designated Green Belt, whereby as set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), most development, subject to certain exceptions, is regarded as inappropriate. Paragraphs 149 and 150 of the National Planning Policy Framework and Policies LP57, LP58, LP59 and LP60 of the Kirklees Local Plan outline exemptions to where extensions, conversions, the redevelopment of previously developed sites and the change of use of land could be appropriate. However, cumulatively, the works are not compliant with any of these exceptions therefore the development constitutes inappropriate development in the Green Belt. Furthermore, the development would cause significant harm to the openness of the Green Belt and visual amenities of the Green Belt through introducing a number of extensions, extensive hardstanding and intensifying the use of the site, which is in the open countryside. There would also be conflict with one of the purposes of including land within Green Belt. There are no very special circumstances to clearly outweigh the harm to the Green Belt caused by reason of inappropriateness and other harm. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies LP57, LP58, LP59 and LP60 of the Kirklees Local Plan and Chapter 13 of the National Planning Policy Framework.'

Referring to the officer's delegated report in the previous application, it would appear that the LPA had three main issues with the previous proposals in relation to the impact on the Green Belt. The following paragraphs highlight these issues and how they have been addressed in the current proposals.

Issue 1: The two-storey side extension to the gable end of the attached barn does not appear as a proportionate addition to the barn and is therefore contrary to paragraph 149 c) in the NPPF and Local Plan Policy LP57 a. ¹

Our response: The proposed two-storey extension as opposed to introducing a single storey extension, has been retained for architectural reasons. It was considered that a single storey monopitch extension would be architecturally the wrong thing to do. The previous scheme had an extension which was slightly longer than the existing barn and the LPA stated that it caused confusion as to which element was the extension.

As such, the proposed extension is now lower, narrower, and shorter than the existing barn and results in a subservient addition to the original building. Furthermore, a single storey extension would make the link to the detached barn much more complex to achieve in relation to the roof connections. It was considered important that the design of the link extension be simple, small, and fully glazed in order to be transparent and unintrusive.

¹ Page 9 Officers Report 2022/92169

In terms of the actual volume of extensions, the existing attached and detached barns have a volume of $497 + 218 = 715$ cu.m. The volume of the proposed extensions is 270 cu.m. This equates to a 37% or roughly one third increase. Therefore, when considered as an extension to the attached and detached barns (because they will be linked), it is considered the extensions would not result in disproportionate additions to the original structures. It is also considered that the reduced scale and improved design of the extensions, including the fenestration, would be more in keeping with the original character and appearance of the existing attached barn.

In light of the above, the proposed two-storey extension would now appear as a proportionate addition to the barn and therefore complies with paragraph 154 c) in the NPPF and Local Plan Policy LP57.

Issue 2: The extensive hard surfacing required in front of the cottages would result in 'urbanising' excavations and encroachment into the open countryside. This is contrary to paragraphs 143 and 155 e) and Local Plan Policies LP57 LP58 and LP60. ²

Our response: The proposed hardstanding and parking areas have now been minimalised as much as possible. The minimum parking requirements in accordance with the guidance in the Kirklees Highways Design Guide SPD have been applied. This results in three car parking spaces for No. 21/23 and for the new dwelling, two car parking spaces for No. 25 and No. 27, and one visitor parking space (a reduction of six visitor spaces from the previous scheme). Grasscrete geogrid is also proposed for the parking areas to soften these spaces.

A turning head has been provided in order to comply with 45m Building Regulations fire engine requirements, but this again has been kept to a minimum.

All this has enabled the areas for hardstanding to be minimalised and given more sympathetic surface treatments such as grass-filled eco-grid and gravel-field eco-grid. It also enables the original drystone boundary wall to be re-instated to the rear of the cottages.

It is therefore considered that the proposals are now acceptable in this regard and comply with paragraph 143 ³ in the NPPF, and paragraph 155 e) in the NPPF and Local Plan Policies LP57, LP58 and LP60 in respect of preserving Green Belt openness.

Issue 3: The rebuilding and extension to the detached barn is considered to be inappropriate in relation to the size of the replacement building which is being doubled in size. This is contrary to paragraph 154 g) in the NPPF and Local Plan Policy LP59. ⁴

Our response: The detached barn is proposed to be carefully (and not fully) dismantled in accordance with the submitted Structural Survey, the stones numbered, and then rebuilt as existing using the original stone, building in the openings as existing. The detached barn would form an annex to the new dwelling as previously recommended by officers with a sympathetic single storey glazed link connecting the barn to the extended part of the attached barn. The link would maintain visibility of both buildings, thereby providing visual separation.

² Pages 9 and 10 Officer's Report 2022/92169

³ Maintaining the five purposes of the Green Belt

⁴ Pages 9 and 10 Officer's Report 2022/92169

This part of the proposed development is therefore now considered to be acceptable in conjunction with the works to convert and extends the detached barn as described above, and in compliance with paragraph 154 g) in the NPPF and Local Plan Policy LP59 with regards to the development having no greater impact on Green Belt openness than the existing.

It is also important to note that the size of the single storey rear extensions to No. 25 and No. 27 were previously considered to be acceptable by officers as 'proportionate' additions to the original dwellings.

Given the above, it is considered that the proposed development has adequately addressed and overcome the previous reason for refusal and now complies with all relevant local and national Green Belt policies.

Design and Heritage Impact

The second reason for refusal in the previous application relates to the design and heritage impact and states the following:

'2. The development subject of this application, by virtue of the quantity, siting, scale and design of the extensions, the design of the replacement barn, the design of the alterations, the demolition of the barn and the urbanising nature of the change of use and engineering operations in order to create four residential properties, would represent poor design and result in an incongruous form of development in the rural locality that would cause less than substantial (but very serious) harm to the significance of the Grade II listed building, as well as detrimental harm to the visual amenities of the locality. The less than substantial harm caused to the significance of the listed building would not be outweighed by public benefits. As such, the development would be contrary to Policies LP24(a) and LP35 of the Kirklees Local Plan, Government guidance contained within Chapters 12 and 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework and Principles 2 and 14 of the Council's adopted Housebuilders Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document.'

A number of concerns relating to design and heritage impact were raised on the previous application. In response to these concerns, the current proposals now seek to do the following:

- The detached barn is proposed to be partially dismantled, re-built and restored as original with only minor alterations to form an annex to the attached barn. An updated Structural Report is enclosed as part of the application which provides full details concerning precisely what the current condition of the barn is, the jeopardy of its future condition if left, detailed proposals to retain as much of the fabric as possible, and a methodology in terms of how the barn can be salvaged and hence brought back into beneficial use.
- The previously excavated areas and drystone walls are proposed to be restored. Hardstanding and parking areas have been minimised as much as possible (as detailed above). A turning head is to be provided in order to comply with 45m Building Regulations fire engine access requirements. A grasscrete geogrid is proposed to soften the necessary parking areas, and gravel based eco-grid is proposed immediately to the rear of the buildings.
- The number of rooflights has been significantly reduced and the proposed rooflights are now conservation style only.

- Windows to existing openings in No. 21-23 (ground and first floor) and No. 25 and No. 27 (ground floor) are proposed to be replaced with timber framed, slim double glazed, sash windows with vertical glazing bars.
- The windows recently installed at first floor level on No. 25 and No. 27 (timber framed, slim double glazed, side hung casements) are proposed to be retained in agreement with the Kirklees Conservation & Design officer.
- An extension to No. 21-23 is no longer proposed and has been removed from the scheme.
- The single storey rear extensions proposed on No. 25 and No. 27 have been reduced in size from 4.5m projection to 3.2m. The width of each extension has also been reduced from 6m wide to 5.25m. The extensions are therefore modest in size and would include simple glazed frontages.
- The barn conversion has been redesigned and now includes a smaller (shorter and lower) extension and a simpler, smaller glass link connecting it to the detached barn. The alterations also include more 'barn-like' style openings in order to retain the agricultural character. It is also proposed to keep the glazing to barn arches as simple glass screens with no divisions. The reduced scale and improved design of the extension means it is now in keeping with the original character and appearance of the barn.

A single storey extension has been ruled out as it would make the link to the detached barn much more complex to achieve in relation to the roof connections. It is considered important that the design of the link extension be simple, small, and fully glazed in order to be transparent and unintrusive, thereby not detracting from the character and appearance of either set of listed buildings.

- Important internal features are proposed to be retained such as original fire places, mullions, and window surrounds.

The proposed development is therefore considered to be towards the lower end of 'less than substantial' harm and NPPF Paragraph 208 states: *Where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use.*

The public benefits are considered to outweigh any limited harm through the following:

- 1) Improving the living accommodation whilst preserving important historic features and elements of the buildings and the site such as the revealed carpenter's marks and fireplaces.
- 2) The incorporation of high-quality design that links the old and the new to leave a positive mark including revealing the historic fabric and elements of the listed structure.
- 3) Restoring and thereby protecting the longevity of the detached barn.
- 4) Improving the thermal efficiency and energy use of the dwellings, making them attractive homes for future generations with much lower costs in heating.

- 5) The use of local tradespeople and support for local traditional crafts (joinery and linework for example).

The revised Heritage Statement, which accompanies the application, addresses the above matters in detail, and includes an assessment of significance in relation to the listed buildings and their settings. Given the above, it is considered that the proposed development has adequately addressed and overcome the previous heritage reasons for refusal and now complies with Local Plan Policy LP35 and the aims of Chapter 16⁵ in the NPPF.

Residential Amenity

The third reason for refusal in the previous application relates to residential amenity and states the following:

'3. The proposed development, by virtue of the size and scale of the rear extensions to be provided for dwellings/plots 2 and 3, would result in a cramped form of development, as an inadequate amount of private outdoor amenity space would be provided for these proposed properties. This would not provide a high standard of amenity for the future occupiers of these properties and would therefore be contrary to Policy LP24(b) of the Kirklees Local Plan, Principle 17 of the Council's adopted Housebuilders Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document and Chapter 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework.'

Referring once again to the officer's delegated report in the previous application, it is noted that the LPA were satisfied that the proposed development would not result in any material overbearing, overshadowing or overlooking, and the proposals were deemed acceptable with regards to internal space standards. In this respect the development complied with Principles 6 and 17 in the Kirklees Housebuilders Design Guide SPD.

The issue of outdoor space, however, the report states that, *'the gardens for dwellings 2 and 3 are insufficient and would not provide a good level of amenity for the future occupants. These gardens are very small and therefore contrary to Principle 17 of the SPD and Policy LP24 of the KLP.'*⁶

The current proposals have reduced the size of the extensions, which now allows for more outdoor amenity space to the rear of No. 25 and No. 27. It is also worth noting that these cottages already have fairly minimal amounts of curtilage. At the pre-application meeting, officers also considered that the revised amenity space provision now appears to provide a suitable amount of space. A query was raised in relation to the areas beyond the two barns, and its historical use as possible curtilage. With reference to Google Earth historical imagery, it can be seen that these areas were used in connection with the domestic use of the properties (see image overleaf from 2019), with evidence of structures, mowed lawns etc apparent. The proposed layout plan incorporates some of this area into the curtilage for the barns conversion dwelling, and unlike the current situation, a boundary fence is proposed to clearly demarcate the curtilage / non-curtilage land.

The proposals are therefore now considered to comply with all aspects of residential amenity, and in respect of outdoor amenity space, the proposals accord with Principle 17 of the SPD and Local Plan Policy LP24 b (Design).

⁵ Conserving and enhancing the heritage environment

⁶ Page 20 Officer's Report 2022/92169



Aerial Image 2019

Highway Matters

The fourth reason for refusal in the previous application relates to highway safety and states the following:

'4. No information has been provided to demonstrate improvements to the access, sight lines, gradients or how internal refuse turning can be provided. The proposal has therefore failed to demonstrate that by approving such a development in this location, would not result in an unacceptable conflict and increase to the risk of highway safety of both the existing and future users, especially in relation to the existing access. On the basis of the submitted application the proposal is therefore contrary to Policies LP21 and LP22 of the Kirklees Local Plan, the aims of the Council's adopted Highways Design Guide, Principle 12 of the Council's adopted Housebuilders Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document and Chapter 9 of the National Planning Policy Framework.'

In addressing this reason for refusal, it is important to note that the current proposals do not include the provision of a turning head for large (11.85m) refuse vehicles, because it was considered that the size required would be potentially damaging to the listed building setting, trees and Green Belt openness. However, due to Building Regulation requirements, a turning head and access is needed for a fire tender. This has therefore been provided and shown on the submitted plans. The turning head will also enable cars and delivery vehicles to enter and exit the site in a forward gear.

The current proposals also include the following and are shown on the Preliminary Access Proposal Plan and the Visibility Drawing:

- The existing access is proposed to be widened to 4.5m to allow two cars to pass one another.
- The proposed gradients are shown on the plans.
- Bin storage and collection points.

- The entrance area is proposed to be widened to allow for a better pull-in for bin waggons.
- Visibility at the site entrance has been improved and whilst they don't meet normal standards, the betterment provided for the three dwellings is considered to outweigh any harm created by the single additional dwelling.

At the pre-application meeting, KC Highways officers advised that they consider the previous issues raised have been addressed and taking a view of the scheme as a whole, they consider it likely that the matters which were a cause for concern in the previous application have on balance been accommodated in the proposed amended scheme. This also takes into account the fact that only one additional dwelling is proposed.

The proposals are therefore now considered to be acceptable in relation to highway matters and have adequately overcome the previous reason for refusal. The development accords with Local Plan Policies LP21 and LP22, ⁷ Principles 12 and 19 ⁸ in the Kirklees Housebuilders Design Guide SPD, the guidance within the Kirklees Highways Design Guide SPD and the aims of Chapter 9 in the NPPF.

Trees

The final reason for refusal in the previous application relates to trees and states the following:

'5. In the absence of any details in relation to the impact which the development would have on the mature trees (within and adjacent to the site), it has not been sufficiently demonstrated that the proposal would prevent harm in terms of directly or indirectly threatening trees which contribute to public amenity and the significance of the nearby Grade II listed building. The development would therefore be contrary to Policies LP33 and LP35 of the Kirklees Local Plan, Principle 7 of the Council's adopted House Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document and Chapters 12, 15 and 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework.'

A Tree Survey has previously been undertaken on the site. In addressing this reason for refusal, an Arboricultural Impact Assessment has been produced and is submitted as part of the application. The key findings and recommendations from the AIA are as follows:

- There are a total of 27 individual trees and four groups of trees on the application site.
- The trees include 15 category 'B' trees, 11 category 'C' trees and 1 category 'U' tree. The four groups of trees are categorised as low-quality.
- The proposed development will require the removal of three category 'C' trees (T003, T004 and T026). In accordance with BS 5837:2012, these trees should not be considered a constraint to the development.
- The root protection areas (RPAs) of five trees will be impacted by the proposed widening of the driveway (T001, T002, T005, and T006) and by the refurbishment of hardstanding (T001, T002, T005, T006 and T010). These are all category 'B' trees other than T005 which is a category 'C' tree.

⁷ Highways and Access, and Parking

⁸ Parking and Waste

- The proposals are considered feasible provided that mitigation measures are implemented during construction.
- Recommended mitigation measures include the following:
 - Any existing vegetation within the tree RPAs should be removed using hand-operated tools.
 - All excavations into the soil within the RPAs of T001 and T002 should be carried out using a compressed air soil displacement method.
 - If major roots that are greater than 25mm are encountered, these should not be severed without first consulting with the Project Arboriculturalist.
 - The use of alternative methods of kerb edge support.
 - Temporary tree protection fencing should be installed to ensure the RPAs of the retained trees are suitably protected.
- It is also recommended that the development works follow the outline AMS provided in Appendix 3 of the report.

Given the above, and subject to any conditions deemed necessary in order to secure the above, the proposed development is now considered to be acceptable with regards to trees and complies with Local Plan Policies LP33 and LP35, Principle 7 in the Kirklees Housebuilders Design Guide SPD and the aims of Chapters 12, 15 and 16 in the NPPF.

Other Matters

Ecology

An updated Bat Survey comprising of a site inspection and a dusk emergence survey was undertaken by Knight Sky Ecology in August 2023. The primary aim of the survey was to gather updated information on the presence or absence of any bat roosts at the site. The main conclusions of the report are as follows:

- No evidence of a bat roost was recorded during the dusk emergence surveys on the attached barn and the detached outbuilding.
- The cottages are limited to potential bat roost features in the roof. The surveys on the attached barn and cottages did not record any indication of a roost site.
- Bat activity was low and dominated by Common Pipistrelle with one to two bats foraging around the property and the adjacent treelines. A low number of Noctule Bat and Brown Long-Eared Bat passes were recorded.
- No habitats of foraging value for bats are to be affected by the proposals.

It is therefore considered that bats do not present a potential ecological constraint to the proposed development. The proposals will not result in any undue impacts to bats and will therefore remain compliant with relevant legislation. No further assessments or detailed mitigation is recommended.

The proposals are therefore considered to be acceptable in relation to ecology, and bats more specifically, in compliance with Local Plan Policy LP30 (Biodiversity and Geodiversity), Principle 9 in the Housebuilders Design Guide SPD (Biodiversity) and the aims of Chapter 15 in the NPPF.

Climate Change

The delegated officer's report for the previous application stated, *In this case, it has been noted that the dwellings would be constructed to modern building regulations which would aid in improving the overall thermal efficacy of the property. The use of windows to habitable rooms would also help reduce the need to artificial light and improve passive solar gain. In addition, in the case of an approval, a condition would be attached to the decision notice requiring the installation of an Electric Vehicle Charge Point for the parking spaces to each dwelling. This is to help mitigate the impact on air quality and to support infrastructure for low emission vehicles.*

The applicant would be content to install one electric charging point per dwelling, however given the sensitive nature of the listed buildings and their settings, there are no specific proposals at this time for solar / PV panels, air source heat pumps etc.

The proposed development would therefore contribute towards mitigating climate change and accords with paragraph 157 in the NPPF and Local Plan Policy LP24.

Drainage

The previous application stated that the site would connect to a mains sewer for surface and foul water drainage. This was accepted by the LPA and the proposed development remains unchanged in this regard. The proposals therefore remain acceptable with regards to drainage and are in accordance with Local Plan Policy LP28 (Drainage) and the aims of Chapter 14 in the NPPF.

Contaminated Land

The delegated officer's report for the previous application stated that, *'the site has been identified on our mapping system as potentially contaminated due to its proximity to a quarry. As such staged contaminated land conditions could be attached should permission be granted.'*

It is considered that suitably worded conditions can be attached to the permission to ensure that appropriate mitigation measures are complied with in accordance with Local Plan Policy LP53 (Contaminated and unstable land) and NPPF paragraph 191.

Robert Halstead Chartered Surveyors & Town Planners

January 2024