

## **Nelson, Brierfield and Reedley Committee – Planning Update Report – 2<sup>nd</sup> September 2024**

### **24/0197/FUL - Land adjacent 112 Halifax Road, Brierfield**

As set out in the Committee report, an update to Members can now be provided regarding the Finished Floor Levels of the proposed dwellings. The applicant has provided an amended plan which indicates the finished floor levels as well as the levels of the existing properties in the surrounding area. The ridge heights of the properties on Mansfield Crescent, to the rear of the application site are 192m, 193m and 194m respectively. The finished floor level of the bungalows in Block B which is closest to the existing dwellings on Mansfield Crescent is to be 185.5m. The existing ground level here has been measured on the topographical survey ranging between 184.23m and 186.22m AOD, so there would not be a perceivable change in levels which would unacceptably impact residential amenity. The bungalows at Block A closest to Chapel Street are to have a finished floor level of 185.1m AOD. The existing levels on the topographical survey indicate that the existing levels in this area of the site range from 184.6 to 184.8m, as such the finished floor levels of the bungalows in Block A would not be a significantly greater height which would result in an unacceptable neighbouring amenity issue.

Overall, there is no unacceptable impact upon residential amenity and this does not change from the report as drafted. As such, the recommendation remains to delegate grant consent, subject to satisfactory outcome of drainage issue.

### **24/0495/HHO - 119 Clayton Street**

Following the publication of the committee report, two more objections were received from neighbours. One of them was from a neighbour who has already sent in their objection earlier.

The objections raise the following concerns in summary:

- appears unbalanced and represents more of a commercial building rather than a home
- The property is equipped with CCTV cameras at the front covering both directions and both sides of the house. Allowing further upwards building will allow the intrusive feature to continue to intimidate neighbouring residents and act like the “surveillance house”.
- If this application is approved, it will suggest the decision-making process is not impartial and will show bias towards this application
- The communication pole at the side of the property serves houses on Albert Street, Stanley Street, and beyond. There is concern that the extension could disrupt the stable broadband connection recently established in the area, as it appears the pole may need to be relocated
- why the rear side elevations are no longer deemed significant to the character of the Whitefield Conservation area when it still will remain highly visible from three different public vantage points

### Officer Comments

Concerns have been raised regarding impact on the Conservation Area and consistency with the previous decision. A previous application 24/0267/HHO was submitted for the same scheme with the only difference being an additional dormer to the front and the rear dormer being flat roofed. Permission for this earlier application was refused by the Development Management Committee based solely on the front dormer's unacceptable impact upon the design of the original dwelling and harm to the wider character and appearance of the Whitefield Conservation Area. This decision established the Council's position that the proposed two storey rear extension and rear dormer is acceptable. The current application proposes the same two storey rear extension as 24/0267/HHO and a pitched roof rear dormer with the front dormer removed. Taking into account the established position of the Council on the two storey rear extension and rear dormer, the amended pitched roof design of the rear dormer and the location of the application site next to an ATC hut, and industrial buildings and car parking area of a window manufacturing unit, on balance the proposal would be acceptable in terms of its design and its impact on the character of the dwelling and the Conservation Area.

Domestic CCTV does not generally require a planning application and is not part of this application and impact on broadband connections is not a material consideration for a planning application of this type. Impacts on the visual amenity of the area and significance of the Conservation Area are addressed in the Committee report. The recommendation remains to approve as set out in the report.