

Planning Statement

SINGLE STOREY EXTENSION TO SIDE

FOX LODGE, WHITLEY ROAD, WHITLEY, DEWSBURY, WF12 0LU

**PREPARED FOR: MR AND MRS BROTHERTON
PREPARED BY: JAMES ROBERTS MRTPI**

1. INTRODUCTION

This statement has been prepared to support the submission of a householder planning application for a single storey extension to the side of an existing dwelling. The extension follows the approval of the newly constructed dwelling at appeal (APP/Z4718/W/22/3292554). The proposed extension is entirely proportionate relative to the size of the original building and is therefore an appropriate form of development in the Green Belt.

It is anticipated that the Local Planning Authority (LPA) will adopt a progressive approach to this sustainable scheme. Given the planning history for the site, it is anticipated that the application should be a simple one for officers to deal with.

2. THE SITE

The application consists of a newly constructed dwelling located off Whitley Road, Whitley:



The property has yet to be formally named but is due to be called Fox Lodge. The building is a simple, single storey dwelling which is now fully watertight and has reached “first fix” stage. It is therefore a building.

3. THE PROPOSAL

It is proposed to construct a single storey extension to the side of the existing building. The extension would provide an additional bedroom, boot room and WC. The proposed extension would match the existing building in terms of design and use of materials. It would be set back and down from the host building to ensure visual subservience.

4. PLANNING HISTORY AND PRE-APPLICATION DISCUSSIONS

The key planning history for the site is the afore mentioned appeal decision for the dwelling.

Given the simple nature of the proposed development, it was not considered necessary to discuss this application with planning officers prior to submission.

5. ALLOCATIONS, POLICIES AND ASSESSMENT

Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires planning applications to be determined in accordance with the Development Plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. In this instance the Development Plan consists of the Kirklees Local Plan. Material considerations exist in the form of national policy and guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) as updated in July 2021 and the suite of documents comprising National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG).

This is a simple application to extend an existing building. As such, it is not considered necessary to provide a lengthy list of relevant policies. The key considerations are:

1. *Would the extension be a proportionate addition to the original building?*

The proposal would result in a volumetric increase above and beyond that of the original building. The level of increase would be less than 30% of the original volume. Furthermore, the proposed extension would clearly be visually subservient to the original building. It could not reasonably be described as disproportionate relative to the original building and should be considered acceptable in this regard.

2. *Would the extension have an unacceptable impact on visual amenity?*

The proposed extension would tie in with the appearance of the existing building and would be constructed using matching materials. The extension would not be visually prominent and would not have any adverse impact on the character of the site or surrounding area. The proposal should be considered acceptable in this regard.

3. *Would the living conditions of neighbours be adversely affected?*

The proposed extension would not be highly prominent and the existing boundary treatment along the boundary would screen the extension from the nearest neighbouring property. In determining the previous appeal, the Inspector commented:

“Due to the layout of the site, the proposed dwelling would face the rear garden of No. 106 Whitley Road, sitting on higher land and with a large amount of glazing along the facing elevation. The main parties agree that there would be no direct overlooking of the rear garden of No. 106 and, based on my observations, I have no reason to disagree.

It has been argued that a perception of being overlooked would remain for the residents of No. 106. I acknowledge that this is a legitimate, material consideration. However, any such perception for the residents of No. 106 would be reduced by the

fact that the majority of the facing glazing of the proposal would be screened, with only the topmost part of the windows visible. As such, it would be reasonably evident to residents that no direct overlooking would be possible from the visible section of the proposal's windows. This would remove any undue perception of overlooking and ensure that residents' enjoyment of the rear garden would not be impacted."

The same principle would apply here. However, because the window would be lower and set back from the existing frontage, it would not even be visible from the neighbouring property. impacts in relation to residential amenity should be considered acceptable.

4. Are there any other issues which would prevent the grant of planning permission?

There are no other issues which should prevent the grant of planning permission.

6. CONCLUSION

The proposal would result in a proportionate addition to the original building. It would not therefore result in inappropriate development within the Green belt and there is no need to demonstrate very special circumstances.

For the reasons set out above, the proposal would be acceptable in all other regards and should therefore be approved without delay. The Applicant is willing to discuss any issues that may arise during the consideration of the proposal with the LPA.

James Roberts (BA, MSc, MRTPI)

JR Planning