

Address: 3 Greenlea Court Holmfirth hd9 6db

### About the application

Application number: 2024/90620	
What is the application for?:	Erection of rear extension and front and rear dormer extensions (within a Conser
Address of the site or building:	5A, Greenway, Honley, Holmfirth, HD9 6NQ
Postcode:	HD9 6NQ

### User comments

Type of comment: An objection	
Do you wish your comments to be published on the website anonymously?	No
<p>Here we go again. Last year an application (2023/92994) was submitted and refused for a two storey extension to the same property, for the following reason:</p> <p>‘The proposed two-storey rear extension by reason of its scale, massing and its proximity to the site boundary, would result in a development that would not be subservient to the original dwelling and would be out of character with the host property and wider locality. To permit such development would be contrary to Kirklees Local Plan Policy LP24b, Policy 1 of the Holme Valley Neighbourhood Plan and Policies contained within Chapter 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework.’</p> <p>Whilst the new proposal is smaller in scale than the previous one, I believe it contains enough similar elements for it to be refused on the same basis.</p> <p>In the decision report on the previous application, the determining Planning Officer concluded the following:</p> <p>“The proposed rear extension would have a projection of 2.74 metres, which is an increased projection from the previously agreed scheme in under 2019/92654 and the same projection as the refused application 2023/92994. Whilst this complies with guidance for maximum projection, which is under the 4m given the dwelling is a detached property, the extension would be within 1 metres of the site boundary at certain points to the side of the extension and to the rear. A site visit confirmed that should the proposed extension be constructed, it would fill in a space within the rear garden, resulting in creating a development with a cramped appearance within this section of the site.”</p> <p>The new scheme still includes a ground floor rear extension that will fill the space to the rear of the property, creating a dwelling that has a cramped appearance within the site, and thereby adversely affecting the appearance of the local street scene.</p>	

In the determination of the previous proposal, the Planning Officer wrote:

“The proposed rear extension would represent an addition to the rear of the dwelling which would create a feeling of overdevelopment within the site. With positioning of the dwelling at the front of a cul-de-sac, the extension would be an out of character addition to the street-scene. Whilst there is a boundary hedge which would screen a single storey extension, the single storey extension would be visible from the pathway and other sections of the cul-de-sac. It is considered that the development would result in development which is not fully compliant with the SPD and there is no justification which would overcome the visually harmful impact of the proposal in this regard. This element of the proposal is therefore considered to be unacceptable.”

This is a reinforcement of the previous point, and the current proposals have not changed to an extent that a different conclusion should be drawn.

In the decision report for the previous proposal the Planning Officer concluded, in relation to parking arrangements:

“The proposal would increase the bedroom capacity from 3 to 4 bedrooms. This requires a minimum of 3 off-street parking spaces to be provided. Two car parking spaces can be accommodated on the driveway located to the front of the dwelling. Under the previous application, KC Highways deemed the integrated garage too small to accommodate a parked vehicle. Given that the garage has not changed in size, this is considered to still be relevant information. This means that the site only has the capacity to accommodate two cars, falling short by 1 car parking space. Parking within the cul-de-sac is not encouraged due to the tight nature of the space between dwellings. Whilst less than ideal, on-street parking can be achieved along Greenway and in this case it is considered satisfactory parking arrangements are present.”

The first point to make in relation to the new proposal is that it is for the creation of a four bedroomed property. Although the drawings label one of the bedrooms a ‘study’, the application itself states that the proposal would create four bedrooms. As such it needs to provide parking space for at least 3 vehicles. Whilst respecting the conclusions of the Planning Officer in relation to the previous proposal, I believe the parking situation has changed in this part of the village over the last 12 months, and is likely to change further in the future. As such, I believe this aspect of the decision merits reconsideration.

Since the previous application was refused, it is apparent that more parents and carers are parking their cars on Greenway while dropping off children at the infants school nearby. In addition, it is likely that car parking charges will be introduced in Honley village centre. This will have inevitable knock-on effects on those residential streets close by. Already, local residents see visitors parking on Greenway to access the village centre, This will undoubtedly increase, and added to the school run issue, means that approving the current proposal for 5A Greenway will just add to these parking problems.

As I stated in commenting on the previous proposal, the new one appears to be an attempt to create a four bedroomed house on a plot that is too small to accommodate it. This would be detrimental to those living in it, and also to the street scene around it. There is substantial development ongoing in Honley of the type of property the applicant is attempting to create, but which is appropriately designed. There is no need to try and shoehorn this proposal into its plot when much more suitable solutions already exist in the local market.