

Application number: 2018/62/93963/E

Applicant: Mr Tarazi

Location: 21, Oakland Court, Highburton, Huddersfield, HD8 0XF

Dear

I would like to **object** to the above application and have the following observations:

1 – Principle of development

1.1 – Sustainable Development

NPPF Paragraph 11 and PLP1 outline a presumption in favour of sustainable development. Paragraph 8 of the NPPF identifies the dimensions of sustainable development as economic, social and environmental (which includes design considerations). It states that these facets are mutually dependent and should not be undertaken in isolation (Para.9).

The dimensions of sustainable development will be considered throughout the proposal.

Paragraph 11 concludes that the presumption in favour of sustainable development does not apply where specific policies in the NPPF indicate development should be restricted. This too will be explored.

1.2 – Land allocation

The site is without notation on the UDP Proposals Map and Policy D2 (development of land without notation) of the UDP states;

“Planning permission for the development ... of land and buildings without specific notation on the proposals map, and not subject to specific policies in the plan, will be granted provided that the proposals do not prejudice [a specific set of considerations]”

All these considerations are addressed later in this assessment.

Consideration must also be given to the emerging local plan. The site is without notation on the PDLP Policies Map. PLP2 states that;

“All development proposals should seek to build on the strengths, opportunities and help address challenges identified in the local plan, in order to protect and enhance the qualities which contribute to the character of these places, as set out in the four sub-area statement boxes below...”

2 – Impact on visual amenity

BE1 requires development to respect local character and be visually attractive. BE2 and BE13 requires new development to be in keeping with existing development, including materials, scale and massing. BE14 states that, typically, rear extensions will be limited to an extension of 3.0m.

Application number: 2018/62/93963/E

Applicant: Mr Tarazi

Location: 21, Oakland Court, Highburton, Huddersfield, HD8 0XF

The extension projects 2.4m, so is considered acceptable in principle in respect. However, the proposed addition is hard up against the common boundary

. The proposed development has eaves which would match the host building. However, the roof ridge is set down a nominal distance from the height of the roof ridge of the original dwelling (as opposed to being lower, so as to appear subservient).

The scale and massing of the extension is considered too great and harms the visual character of the building, being overly dominant to the original building, of an incongruous design and failing to harmonise with the character of the street.

There are considered to be no mitigating circumstances relevant to this specific site that would justify the scale or appearance of the extension proposed.

This would cause harm to visual amenity and would be in breach of policies BE13 and PLP24.

The rear addition would be clearly visible from Southfield Court. Being visible within the wider streetscene exacerbates the concerns regarding the scale and appearance of the extension, harming the visual amenity of the wider area. The proposed extension would harm the visual amenity of the host building and wider streetscene due to its mass, scale, and design.

It is considered to represent poor design failing to take opportunities for improving the character and quality of the area. The proposal is in breach of Policies D2, BE1, BE2, BE13 and BE14 of the UDP, PLP24 of the PDLP and Chapter 12 of the NPPF.

Application number: 2018/62/93963/E

Applicant: Mr Tarazi

Location: 21, Oakland Court, Highburton, Huddersfield, HD8 0XF

3 – Impact on residential amenity

The extension is to be two storeys, and would project 2.4m along the

. This size and mass would cause significantly harmful overbearing and
(the two closest to
the boundary are the only windows serving habitable rooms at the dining room and bedroom) and

The resulting impact would cause , and the amenity of
future occupants .

There is no similar arrangement to that sought within Oakland Court.

Given the above, it is considered that the proposed development would cause harmful overbearing
and in my view.

Application number: 2018/62/93963/E

Applicant: Mr Tarazi

Location: 21, Oakland Court, Highburton, Huddersfield, HD8 0XF

As a rule of thumb, LPA's ordinarily ask for a separation distance of 21m between habitable room windows.

Turning to the impact on _____, there is an existing reduced separation distance of 19m between first floor habitable room windows to the rear of the dwellings.

This distance would be reduced to 17.6m by virtue of the proposed development. This reduced separation distance would have a significantly harmful impact on the amenity that

While a condition could be imposed requiring the windows to be obscure glazed, it is not ordinarily considered acceptable to have a bedroom without some form of clear glazed opening and in any case the scale of the window would be so large as to give an impression of overlooking even with obscure glazing in place. The proposed development would cause harmful

The proposed development would cause significant and unacceptable harmful

Therefore the proposal fails to comply with policies D2, BE1, BE14, PLP24 and paragraph 127 of the NPPF, in my view.

7 – Conclusion

The NPPF has introduced a presumption in favour of sustainable development. The policies set out in the NPPF taken as a whole constitute the Government's view of what sustainable development

Application number: 2018/62/93963/E

Applicant: Mr Tarazi

Location: 21, Oakland Court, Highburton, Huddersfield, HD8 0XF

means in practice. When assessing the proposed development against relevant policies in the development plan and other material considerations. It is considered that the development would not constitute sustainable development and therefore, it is respectfully considered that the application should be recommended for refusal.

Please feel free to contact me, should you wish to discuss the matter further.

Kind regards,