

About the application

Application number: 2018/93963	
What is the application for?:	Erection of two storey rear extension
Address of the site or building:	21, Oakland Court, Highburton, Huddersfield, HD8 0XF
Postcode:	HD8 0XF

User comments

Type of comment: An objection
<p>I would like to object to the above application and have the following observations:</p> <p>Impact on visual amenity</p> <p>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.</p> <p>The extension projects 2.4m, so is considered acceptable in principle in respect. However, the proposed addition is hard up against the common boundary with the attached dwelling . 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).</p> <p>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.</p> <p>There are considered to be no mitigating circumstances relevant to this specific site that would justify the scale or appearance of the extension proposed.</p> <p>This would cause harm to visual amenity and would be in breach of policies BE13 and PLP24.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>

Impact on residential amenity

The extension is to be two storeys, and would project 2.4m along the shared boundary at n Oakland Court. This size and mass would cause significantly harmful overbearing and overshadowing

The resulting impact would cause material harm to my residential amenity, and the amenity of future occupants that may live at Oakland Court.

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 overshadowing of my home at Oakland Court, in my view.

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

Turning to the impact on no. Southfield Court, to the rear, 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 the residents of Southfield Court have the right to enjoy.

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 overlooking and overbearing of Southfield Court.

The proposed development would cause significant and unacceptable harmful overbearing and overshadowing at Oakland Court and harmful overlooking and overbearing of Southfield Court.

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

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 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

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,