

PROPOSED ERECTION OF EXTENSIONS
AND ALTERATIONS TO EXISTING BUNGALOW,
DEMOLITION OF EXISTING OUTBUILDINGS AND ERECTION OF DOUBLE
GARAGE
at
178 MARSH LANE,
SHEPLEY, HUDDERSFIELD, HD8 8AY

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 The application seeks full planning permission for the above.

1.2 It comprises: -

- Application form and certificates
- Location Plan – WHPR 22/0027/01
- Existing WHPR 22/0027/02
- Proposed – WHPR 22/0027/03B
- Plan of Existing Buildings/Extensions
- Footprint Calculations of Proposals

2.0 SITE HISTORY

2.1 The property comprises a detached bungalow (shown as 1 on the Plan of Existing Buildings/Extensions) to which extensions have been added (shown as 2 and 3).

2.2 Within the curtilage are various ancillary outbuildings (shown as A-E)

2.3 An application 2023/90229 to raise the roof and erect extensions, effectively to achieve a two-storey house, was refused on 20 March 2023 because it was considered to comprise disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building, thus constituting inappropriate additions in the Green Belt.

2.4 On 14 June 2024 a response was received from the Council to a request for pre-application advice for a revised scheme (2024/20503). Again, the proposal was to extend upwards to create a 2-storey dwelling.

2.5 The pre-application response was that the cumulative impact of the existing extensions together with these proposed as well as the proposed design was such that the proposals could not be supported.

3.0 ASSESSMENT

3.1 Full account has been taken of the reason for refusal of the planning application and the comments on the request for pre-application advice in drawing up the proposals the subject of this application.

3.2 Firstly, it is not now proposed to form a 2-storey house. The bungalow will remain with a bedroom to be formed in the existing/extended attic roof space. The ridge height will remain as existing.

3.3 The essence of the building will remain, albeit with the logical alteration of relocating the main entrance to the front south-eastern elevation.

3.4 An unattractive porch to the existing rear door which is prominent to that front, south – eastern elevation will be replaced with a substantial attractive extension which takes its design references from those of the original.

3.5 A major element of this statement is to address the issue of concern about the impact of the overall proposals on the openness of the Green Belt.

3.6 The plan of existing building/extensions and footprint calculations which forms part of this application show the following: -

- Existing extensions to original bungalow (2 and 3) – 42 sq.m.

- Proposed extensions – 63 sq.m.

Giving a total footprint increase to the original bungalow of 105 sq.m.

3.7 The proposed outbuildings which it is proposed to demolish (outbuildings A-E) have a total footprint of 137.2 sq.m.

3.8 Thus there is proposed a net reduction of 32.2sq.m. of floor area.

3.9 However, also proposed is a double garage of 45 sq.m giving a total of 150sq.m. of all building, which gives a net increase of 12.8sq.m.

3.10 All matters considered, such an increase effectively represents an approximate 16% increase over and above the 81sq.m. footprint of the original bungalow.

3.11 Such an increase is well within the scope of a not disproportionate addition to an original building as provided for at paragraph 154 c) of the National Planning Policy Framework.

3.12 It is noted that in the pre-application response referred to at paragraph 2.5 above, it is stated that the outbuildings to be removed "... do not appear to be substantial structures and are sporadic structures that are iterative and subservient elements to the main house. To combine these to mitigate the increase in development would lose all subtlety of the smaller, more modest individual elements of the structures and their incremental cumulative impacts in terms of footprint and scale. As such officers do not consider that these could satisfactorily off set the increase"

3.13 I disagree. It is noted that the pre-application advice is given without the benefit of a site visit. I anticipate that a site visit by the case officer will show how the openness of the Green Belt is compromised by these outbuildings and how the proposed extensions and garage will significantly reduce that impact.

3.14 Further, it is argued that though the proposed extensions to the bungalow will significantly increase the percentage of additions, the design proposed will tidy up

the front elevation and will retain the essence of the original building as a bungalow. As such, though the resulting form does not fully comply with guidance in the Council's House Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document, it is an attractive and well considered outcome, rescuing a rather tired and dated building.

4.0 CONCLUSION

4.1 it is concluded that the proposals now put forward comprise a package that properly addresses the Green Belt and design concerns expressed in respect of previous proposals.

4.2 As such it is considered that planning permission should be granted.

Malcolm Sizer

Malcolm Sizer Planning Ltd.

January 2025.