

PLANNING STATEMENT

Proposed erection of detached dwellings (maximum 5)

At

Land adjacent to and behind 53, Gate Head,

Marsden, Huddersfield

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 This application seeks Permission in Principle for a maximum of 5 detached dwellings to be accessed and erected on land adjacent to and behind 53, Gate Head.

1.2 In support of the application is Drawing S25.01 dated March 2025.

1.3 The location plan shows the application site edged red and other land owned by my client edged blue.

1.4 The block plan shows access/egress to be taken from Gate Head adjacent to the gable wall of No.53.

1.5 The land shown within the red line of the application includes land within the site area of application 2023/92592 for which planning permission for the erection of a detached dwelling was granted in April 2024.

1.6 That area of overlap is approved for the turning of cars under the 2023/92592 permission. It is envisaged that the access would be so arranged that internal turning facilities and parking would be provided for the new dwelling essentially as already approved together with access continuing to the new courtyard to serve the proposed new dwellings.

2.0 LOCAL PLAN POLICY

2.1 All the land for which residential permission in principle is sought is shown without notation on the Policies Map.

2.2 The application site comprises undeveloped land which, together with other (blue) land lies adjacent to land designated as Green Belt at its north-western edge and adjacent to residential development elsewhere.

2.3 The site is not within or adjacent to a concentration area nor is it close to a listed building.

3.0 ASSESSMENT OF THE PRINCIPLE OF DEVELOPMENT

3.1 The application site comprises part of 'left-over' land between land designated as Green Belt and existing residential development.

3.2 That strikes me as illogical in principle. It comprises rough grassland, used for occasional grazing. The land falls fairly steeply to the south and I can only assume that its failure to be identified as a housing site is for reasons of cost construction and questionable viability. It represents a potentially developable resource.

3.3 My client is of the view that development as proposed is perfectly feasible and likely to be viable.

3.4 As such this proposal must be considered against prevailing policy and guidance.

3.5 In this regard I draw specific attention to the following –

- Chapter 5 of the NPPF notes the Government's objective of significantly boosting the supply of homes;

- the Council cannot demonstrate a five-year supply of deliverable housing sites. Nor can it pass the Housing Delivery Test.

- As such housing applications must be considered in the context of paragraph 11 of the NPPF which triggers a presumption in favour of sustainable development.

- This means – “Where there are no relevant development plan policies, or the policies which are most important for determining the application are out-of-date (NPPF Footnote 8), granting permission unless:

- (i) the application of policies in this Framework that protect areas or assets of particular importance (NPPF Footnote 7) provides a strong reason for refusing the development proposed ; or (ii) any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this Framework taken as a whole, having particular regard to key policies for directing development to sustainable locations, making effective use of land, securing well-designed places and providing affordable homes, individually or in combination (NPPF Footnote 9).”

3.6 It is considered that there are no adverse impacts on assets of particular importance, nor are there any adverse impacts generated by the proposal that would significantly outweigh the benefits.

3.7 As such it is considered that there is no good reason why the application should be refused, it being put forward as being acceptable in terms of location, land use and the amount of development proposed.

Malcolm Sizer

Malcolm Sizer Planning Ltd.

May 2025