

PLANNING STATEMENT  
Incorporating  
Green Belt Statement  
Proposed Extensions to Dwelling  
at  
Pendlehurst,34, Sandbeds,  
Honley, Holmfirth HD9 6RD  
Application reference 2024/91567

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 This statement is submitted in support of an application which seeks full planning permission for the above. 4No. appendices are attached.

1.2 It is one of three applications submitted in respect of the property, the others being – 2024/91569 – Application to determine if prior approval is required for a proposed larger home extension; and 2024/91568 – Application for certificate of lawfulness for proposed erection of side and rear extensions with dormer and hip to gable roof.

1.3 Those 2 No. applications are presently undetermined.

2.0 POLICY CONTEXT.

2.1 The key policy consideration is that the application site is within the Green Belt as shown on the Proposals Map which forms part of the Kirklees Local Plan.

2.2 Local Plan Policy LP57 relates to the extension, alteration or replacement of existing buildings in the Green Belt.

2.3 It requires 'a) that in the case of extensions, the original building remains the dominant element both in terms of size and overall appearance.

2.4 Chapter 13 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) deals with Protecting Green Belt land.

2.5 Paragraph 154 (c) of the NPPF essentially includes that the extension or alteration of a building in the Green Belt is appropriate ‘... provided that it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building.’

### 3.0 BACKGROUND TO STATEMENT

3.1 This statement is submitted following a request from the council for a Green Belt Statement ‘in light of the size/scale of the proposed development and Green Belt allocation of the site.’

### 4.0 ASSESSMENT OF THE APPLICATION

4.1 The request from the Council implies that the proposal is in conflict with Green Belt policy and as such should be refused unless very special circumstances exist.

4.2 Such a position is not necessarily accepted.

4.3 However, in the light thereof it is argued that what is proposed has less Impact in terms of Green Belt policy than what could be built under a combination of permitted development rights and an approved prior approval proposal.

4.4 As such, a ‘fallback’ situation could exist where the impact of a proposal for which planning permission is sought has less impact on the Green Belt than what could be built under permitted development rights and a prior approval.

4.5 That fallback position is of course what is being sought by the submission of applications 2024/91568 and 2024/91569 referred to at paragraph 1.2 above.

4.6 It is acknowledged that the Council is unlikely to determine this application for planning permission until a decision has been made on the other two applications and the fallback position has thereby been established.

4.7 However, in anticipation of the Council’s approval of the other two applications the following paragraphs set out comparisons between what is proposed in the planning application and what the fallback position will be assuming approval of the other two applications.

4.8 The assessment is undertaken in terms of volume.

4.9 The starting point for the assessment are the volume calculations of the existing, original building shown at Appendix 1. Following are the calculations relating to the 3 No. planning applications at Appendices 2, 3 and 4.

4.10 Appendix 1 (Drawing 01) sets out the volume of the various parts of the original dwelling which totals 548m<sup>3</sup>.

4.11 Excluded from the total is the rear conservatory which it is accepted is not original.

4.12 Appendix 2 (Drawing 03) shows the calculations for the proposals the subject of the application for a Certificate of Lawfulness (2024/91568). The application is in respect of what works can be undertaken under permitted development rights.

4.13 It shows a volume increase of 328m<sup>3</sup> (876-548)

4.14 Appendix 3 (Drawing 04) shows the calculations for the application for a larger Home Extension (2024/91569) submitted to determine if Prior Approval is required.

4.15 It shows the proposed rear extension having a volume of 312m<sup>3</sup>

4.16 In terms of both applications 2024/91568 and 91569, should they be approved, permission would exist for extensions to the original bungalow of 640m<sup>3</sup> less. 110m<sup>3</sup> (328+312) represented by the deletion of the rear ground floor extension on 2024/91568 as it would be replaced by the larger rear extension the subject of 2024/91569.

4.17 Thus the potential increase in volume would be 530m<sup>3</sup>.

4.18 Adding such a potential increase in volume to the volume of the original dwelling gives a total of 1078m<sup>3</sup> (548+530)

4.19 Appendix 4 (this current application 2024(91567)) shows that the total volume of the existing dwelling combined with the proposed extensions is 1060m<sup>3</sup>.

4.20 Accordingly, what is proposed under this current application is a volume increase of 18m<sup>3</sup> (1078-1060) less than what the fallback position would be assuming approval of the other two current applications (2024/91568 and 91569)

## 5.0 CONCLUSION

5.1 I am firmly of the view that the proposals the subject of this application (2024/91567) represent a well-designed addition to the existing bungalow to meet the needs of my clients, having full regard to the fallback position examined earlier.

5.2 I consider that the extensions proposed will have no greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt than those represented by the fallback position

5.3 Further, I consider that the proposals have proper regard to national and local policy and guidance, as will be further addressed in a Supplementary Planning Statement to be submitted very shortly.

5.4 As such I consider that there is no justifiable reason why planning permission should not be granted.

Malcolm Sizer

Malcolm Sizer Planning Ltd.

June 2024.