KIRKLEES METROPOLITAN COUNCIL
INVESTMENT & REGENERATION SERVICE

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT

Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) – SECTION 70

DELEGATED DECISION TO DETERMINE PLANNING APPLICATIONS

Reference No:	**2022/62/90608/W**
Site Address:	92, Rowley Lane, Lepton, Huddersfield, HD8 0EH
Description:	Demolition of garage, carport and rear single storey extension and erection of two storey side extension, single and two-storey rear extensions and single storey front extension with external alterations
Recommending Officer:	Lucy Taylor

DECISION – CONDITIONAL FULL PERMISSION

I hereby authorise the approval of this application for the reasons set out in the officer's report and recommendation annexed below in respect of the above matter.

John Holmes

AUTHORISED OFFICER

Date: 25-Jul-2022

Officer Report.

Reference: 2022/90608

Location: 92, Rowley Lane, Lepton, Huddersfield, HD8 0EH

Proposal: Demolition of garage, carport and rear single storey extension and erection of two storey side extension, single and two-storey rear extensions and single storey front extension with external alterations

Site Description.

92 Rowley Lane is a two-storey semi-detached property located in Lepton, Huddersfield. The property is faced in brick and has a dominant gable roofing form infilled with concrete tiles. The property benefits from a previously erected porch extension. Driveway amenity space is present to the front and side elevations of the host property, with a detached garage and car port located accordingly. A significant extent of garden amenity space is present to the rear.

There is a relatively strong sense of similarity established within the streetscene of Rowley Lane, with a dominant presence of two-storey semi-detached properties. In addition, the properties located in the immediate vicinity of No. 92 all share the same style of design and construction, including the external facing of brick.

The application site is Unallocated in the Kirklees Local Plan; the rear boundary of the site adjoins with land allocated as Green Belt.

Description of Proposal.

Planning permission is sought for the demolition of the existing garage, car port and single storey rear extension, and the erection of a two-storey side extension, a single and two-storey rear extension and a single storey front extension.

The existing detached garage, car port and single storey rear extension will be demolished to facilitate the erection of the proposed extensions at 92 Rowley Lane.

Two-Storey Side Extension:

The proposed two-storey side extension will project from the eastern side elevation of the dwelling by a maximum width of 3 metres, with a length of 6.2 metres and a height of 7.7 metres.

The external walls of the side extension will be constructed from brick and the gable roof will be infilled with concrete tiles.

Within the interior of the dwelling, the extension will function as a garage to the ground floor and as a bathroom and part of a bedroom to the first floor.

An obscurely glazed window will be erected to the first floor front elevation of this two-storey side extension.

Single and Two-Storey Rear Extension:

The two-storey element will project 3.5 metres from the rear elevation of the host dwelling, with a width of 8.7 metres and a height of 7.3 metres.

The external walls will be faced in brick and a double pitched gable roof will be erected, infilled with concrete tiles.

The eastern side of the rear extension will be built on stilts of steel posts, providing a first-floor extension with a passage below.

Within the interior of the dwelling, the extension will be used as a kitchen and family room to the ground floor and as two bedrooms and an ensuite to the first floor.

The single storey extension will project from the rear elevation of the two-storey component by 1.5 metres, with a width of 7.7 metres and a height of 3.6 metres.

The single storey element will also be faced in brick, with a lean-to roofing style infilled with concrete tiles.

The two-storey and single storey extensions propose glazing to only the rear elevation, with two regular windows and one obscurely glazed window proposed to the first floor and one regular window and a set of glazed bi-folding doors to the ground floor.

Single Storey Front Extension:

The proposed single storey front extension will adjoin to the eastern side elevation of the existing front extension, to front the proposed two-storey side extension.

It will have a projection of 1.85 metres, a width of 2.8 metres and a height of 3.7 metres.

The external walls will be faced in brick and the lean-to roofing style will be infilled with concrete tiles.

Within the interior of the dwelling this front extension will also form the garage, with a garage door proposed to be erected on the front elevation.

History of Negotiations.

The case officer sought the following amendments to the originally proposed scheme, to ensure that development would be in accordance with the Council's adopted House Extensions and Alterations SPD:

- The two-storey side extension be set down from the height of the dominant roof pitch by 0.5 metres
- The two-storey side extension be set in from the boundary of curtilage by one metre
- The two-storey side extension be set back from the principle elevation of the dwellinghouse by 500mm
- The two-storey rear extension project out by no more than 3 metres from the rear elevation of the original property
- The two-storey rear extension be set in from the boundary of curtilage by 1.5 metres
- The single storey rear extension be set in from the boundary of curtilage by 1 metre

In response to these sought design amendments, the applicant did not submit any amended plans. Instead, the applicant provided a set of written justifications, in accordance with the 'comply or justify' basis of the SPD.

The applicant submitted the following justifications:

- Only two of the 15 examples (No. 76 and 102) have set the roof height down from the height of the dominant roof pitch previously (only by 150mm). All of the others have the ridge running through level. To set the extension roof lower means that it would be more difficult to construct with potentially more roof maintenance to any stepped flashings. A lower eaves height would compromise the window to the front (possibly needing a dormer window).
- Virtually impossible to set the side extension in from the side boundary of curtilage by one metre to a semi-detached dwelling built in Huddersfield. In this instance a 1m 'gap' would mean the garage doesn't fit (you can't get a car in) and any remaining room on the ground or first floor becomes too narrow to be useable as a habitable room so the side extension would be pointless.
- Of the 15 examples about half have stepped the 1st floor back, but only by 1 brick (100mm). This is more difficult to construct and makes very little difference visually.
- In this instance the property below (no.90) has already had approved and built a 3.5m two storey rear extension full width onto the boundary with no. 92. If this extension was to only be built to 3m, no. 90 will overshadow this new extension as it is to the South of it. Therefore, in this instance, believe 3.5 is full justifiable, given next door already have it.

- None of the adjacent examples have applied a set in of 1.5 metres from the boundary for two-storey side extensions, they have all built onto the boundary, including no's 64, 76, 78, 88, 90 and 102. Also, no.94 is nearly 1 full storey higher than no. 92, so doesn't have the same impact than if the site was flat.
- According to the design guide, a set in distance of 1 metre for single storey rear extensions only appears applicable within a certain set of criteria. The single storey part of this application is only 1.5m out adjacent to the neighbours (no. 92) 2 storey extension, so no overshadowing would occur. The proposed single storey extension is only a 2.5m eaves height and a 3.5m ridge height, which is well within the tolerances/guidance for single storey extensions generally, therefore cannot see a reason to change this as it affects nobody and would compromise the layout.

In addition, the case officer sought the submission of an attic floor plan. The applicant submitted this requested information, showing an attic room and study.

In this instance, the case officer considered the applicant's justifications to be valid and in turn, deemed the proposal acceptable (discussed in greater length in the 'Assessment' section of this report). Therefore, the overall determination of this application is based on the original plans as submitted on 21 February 2022 and the first floor plan as submitted 28 June 2022, as well as the justifications as provided by the applicant.

Relevant Planning History.

On site:

- 2006/94402 – Erection of porch to front - granted permission 2006.

Within the wider streetscene:

- 98/91807 – 217 Rowley Lane – Erection of 2 storey and single storey extensions – granted permission 1998.
- 2003/92074 – 96 Rowley Lane – erection of two storey and single storey extensions – granted permission 2003.
- 2009/93430 - 90 Rowley Lane - Erection of two storey extension porch & garage – granted permission 2010.
- 2019/93506 – 98 Rowley Lane - Erection of single storey front and two storey side and rear extensions – granted permission 2019.
- 2020/90162 – 98 Rowley Lane - Erection of single storey front, side and rear extension – granted permission 2020.

Representations.

We are currently undertaking statutory publicity requirements, as set out at Table 1 in the Kirklees Development Management Charter. As such, we have

publicised this application via neighbour notification letters which expired on 29 March 2022 – no representations were received.

Consultation Responses.

Kirkburton Parish Council – made no comments on the application.

Policy/Legislation.

Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires that planning applications are determined in accordance with the Development Plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The statutory Development Plan for Kirklees is the Local Plan (adopted 27th February 2019).

The application site is Unallocated in the Kirklees Local Plan.

Although it has been acknowledged that the rear boundary of curtilage at 92 Rowley Lane adjoins with designated Green Belt land, it is not deemed necessary to assess this matter further. This is because the scheme proposes only extensions to the host dwelling, which will be retained within the application site and significantly set back from the rear boundary.

The site falls within an area identified by the Coal Authority as being at risk of ground movement due to former mining activity.

Kirklees Local Plan:

- LP1 – Achieving Sustainable Development
- LP2 – Place Shaping
- LP21 – Highway Safety
- LP22 – Parking Provision
- LP24 – Design

Supplementary Planning Documents:

Highways Design Guide SPD (2019)

House Extensions and Alterations SPD

The Kirklees House Extension and Alterations SPD, adopted on 29 June 2021, has been prepared to help householders, developers, agents and architects who are planning and designing an extension or alterations (householder development) to an existing residential property, including conservatories and outbuildings, such as garages. It provides detailed guidance regarding the standard of development that will help achieve a well-designed house extension or alteration required by the Council. The guidance and additional details on Local Plan policies set out in the SPD have been produced on the principle of ‘comply or justify’.

National Policies and Guidance:

National planning policy and guidance is set out in National Policy Statements, primarily the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) published 20th July 2021, together with Circulars, Parliamentary Statements and associated technical guidance. The NPPF constitutes guidance for local planning authorities and is a material consideration in determining applications.

- Chapter 2 – Achieving Sustainable Development
- Chapter 12 – Achieving Well-Designed Places
- Chapter 14 – Meeting the Challenge of Climate Change, Coastal Change and Flooding

Assessment.

The Following matters that will be considered as part of the assessment of the proposal are set below. These considerations will be looked at in detail individually:

1) Principle of development
2) Impact on visual amenity
3) Impact on residential amenity
4) Impact on highway safety
5) Other matters
6) Representations
7) Conclusion

1. **Principle of Development**

The site is without notion in the Kirklees Local Plan. Chapter 2 of the NPPF states that: *"Planning policies and decisions should play an active role in guiding development towards sustainable solutions…"*

Chapter 2 of the NPPF goes onto further state that objectives should: *"support strong, vibrant and healthy communities, providing the supply of housing required to meet the needs of present and future generations; and by fostering a well-designed and safe built environment…"*

In line with the NPPF, policy 1 of the Kirklees Local Plan declares that: *"…the council will take a positive approach that reflects the presumption in favour of sustainable development contained in the NPPF."*

LP1 goes further and states: *"The council will always work pro-actively with applicants jointly to find solutions which mean that proposals can be approved wherever possible, and to secure development that improves the economic, social and environmental conditions in the area."*

Policy LP2 sets out that all development proposals should seek to build on the strengths, opportunities and help address challenges identified in the Local

Plan. Policy LP24 of the KLP is relevant and states that *"good design should be at the core of all proposals in the district".*

In this instance, it can be stated that the principle of development of this application subject to the assessment of impacts on visual and residential amenity, as well as highway safety and any other impacts that may arise.

1. **Impact on Visual Amenity**

The NPPF offers guidance relating to design in chapter 12 (achieving well designed places) whereby paragraph 126 provides a principal consideration concerning design which states: *"The creation of high quality buildings and places is fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve. Good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, creates better places in which to live and work and helps make development acceptable to communities."*

Kirklees Local Plan policies LP1, LP2 and significantly LP24 all also seek to achieve good quality, visually attractive, sustainable design to correspond with the scale of development in the local area, thus retaining a sense of local identity.

LP24 states that proposals should promote good design by ensuring:
"a. the form, scale, layout and details of all development respects and enhances the character of the townscape, heritage assets and landscape…
c. extensions are subservient to the original building, are in keeping with the existing buildings in terms of scale, materials and details..."

Key Design Principles 1 and 2 of the Council's adopted House Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document seek to ensure development is subservient to the host property and in keeping with the character of the locality.
The Council's House Extensions and Alterations SPD further states that two-storey side extensions should:

- not take up all or most of the space to the side of a house
- maintain a 1 metre gap to the side boundary to ensure the building is not too close to a neighbouring property
- be set back at least 500mm from the front wall of the house.

The SPD sets out that two-storey rear extensions should:

- be proportionate to the size of the original house and garden
- not normally exceed 50% of the total area of land around the original house (including previous extensions and outbuildings)
- not project out more than 3 metres from the rear wall of the original house or by 4 metres for detached properties
- not exceed a height at the eaves of 3 metres where the extension is within 1.5 metres of the property boundary

- be separated from the property boundary, such as a wall, fence or hedge, by at least 1.5 metre
- not adversely affect habitable room windows where they adjoin a neighbour's boundary.

The SPD outlines that single storey rear extensions should:

- be in keeping with the scale and style of the original house
- not normally cover more than half the total area around the original house (including previous extensions and outbuildings)
- not exceed 4 metres in height; not project out more than 3 metres from the rear wall of the original house for semi-detached and terraces houses or by 4 metres for detached properties
- where they exceed 3m in length the eaves height should generally not exceed 2.5 meter
- retain a gap of at least 1 metre from a property boundary, such as a wall, fence or hedge.

Finally, the SPD states that front extensions should only be permitted where:

- the house is set well back from the pavement or is well screened
- the extension is small, subservient to the original building, well-designed and would not harm the character of the original house or the area
- the materials and design match the existing features of the original house
- the extension would not unreasonably affect the neighbouring properties.

Although the proposed extensions to 92 Rowley Lane do not conform with criterion of the House Extensions and Alterations SPD as set out above, the applicant has submitted several written justifications detailed within the 'History of negotiations' section of this report which will be taken into account in the consideration of this application.

The proposed extensions to 92 Rowley Lane undoubtably present an increased extent of bulking and massing to the host property, especially with regard to the proposed two-storey side and rear extension. However, the proposal is of a similar design to development approved in 2009 and implemented to the adjoining property no.90 Rowley Lane. In turn, given that the application site will harmonise with its neighbouring property following development, it can be concluded that the extensions will not impact negatively upon the established character of the streetscene or disrupt existing visual relationships with neighbouring properties located in close proximity.

The design of the two-storey extensions will match the appearance of the host property and adjoining property, including the use of matching exterior construction materials and in-keeping forms of fenestration detailing.

Furthermore, the proposed roofing forms will be of a harmonising gable style, that will sympathetically adjoin with the existing dominant roof above 92 Rowley Lane.

The proposed single storey rear extension is of a relatively minor size/scale, with a projection of only 1.5 metres. In turn, it is concluded that this extension is acceptable from a visual amenity perspective. In addition, the proposed height of 3.6 metres and eaves height of 2.55 metres works to ensure no visual detriment from undue levels of bulking and massing. The proposed lean-to roofing form also works to ensure this, by naturally working to mitigate against obtrusiveness.

The proposed single storey front extension will draw on the established architectural design of 92 Rowley Lane, building upon the existing front extension at the property, which was constructed under planning consent 2006/94402. Given the harmonising design of this extension with the existing single storey front extension, and fact it would be of the same scale as a front extension to no.90 it is considered acceptable from a visual amenity perspective. In addition, it should be noted that the proposed location of development is set back from the fronting highway of Rowley Lane, by approximately 10 metres. This seperation distance emphasises the minimal impact of the proposed front extension within the wider streetscene and to the established character of the wider area.

The proposal would not be a subservient addition to the host property and would most likely not be considered acceptable in the event there were not other relevant material considerations that need to be factored into the consideration of this application. The large development to no.90 weighs in favour of the proposal. The development at no.90 has a negative impact upon the outlook from the rear of the host property, and unbalances the pair of semi detached properties when viewed from the street.

The proposal would see the pair of semi detached properties read as being in balance with one another. The fact the adjoining property has already been developed in an unsympathetic manner which is not subservient is considered to be a key factor which in this case provides sufficient justification for non compliance of the proposal with the House Extensions and Alterations SPD.

Therefore, as a result of a previously established precedent to the neighbouring property of No. 90 Rowley Lane, it is considered that the proposal at 92 Rowley Lane would not cause detrimental harm to the visual amenities of the locality. As a result, the proposed development is considered acceptable having regard to policies within Chapter 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework, LP24 of the Kirklees Local Plan and Key Design Principles 1 & 2 of the House Extension and Alterations SPD.

2. **Impact on Residential Amenity**

Section B and C of LP24 states that alterations to existing buildings should: *"…maintain appropriate distances between buildings'* and *'…minimise impact on residential amenity of future and neighbouring occupiers."*

Further to this, Paragraph 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that planning decisions should ensure that developments have a high standard of amenity for existing and future users.

Key Design Principles 3, 4, 5 and 6 of the Council's adopted House Extensions & Alterations SPD seek to ensure development does not have a detrimental impact upon privacy of neighbouring occupiers, cause unacceptable levels of overshadowing or be unacceptably oppressive/overbearing.

Key Design Principle 7 of the SPD states that an appropriate extent of functional amenity space should be retained at the property in conjunction with proposed schemes of development. A significant extent of rear garden amenity space will be retained at 92 Rowley Lane following the erection of the proposed extensions; therefore, Key Design Principle 7 is satisfied.

The properties most likely to be affected by the proposed development are those which directly neighbour the site, these being No. 90 and No. 94 Rowley Lane. It is considered that the proposed extensions would be a sufficient distance away from any other properties to prevent undue harm to residential amenity in terms of loss of light, loss of privacy or overlooking, or the creation of an overbearing affect.

No. 90 Rowley Lane – this property adjoins the application site to the west.

Firstly, it should be noted that, the proposed two-storey side extension poses no significant detriment to the residential amenities of No. 90, for reasons of being set to the eastern side elevation of No. 92 and retained behind the existing footprint and height of the host property. In turn, the side extension will not result in detriment from overbearing, overshadowing or overlooking.

Likewise, the proposed front extension to No. 92 will not significantly affect the residential amenities of No. 90, for reasons of being set to the eastern side of the existing front extension and retained behind the existing footprint and height of this built feature.

The proposed two-storey rear extension at No. 92 will have the same projection as the built two-storey rear extension at No. 90. As a result, the proposed two-storey rear extension to No. 92 poses no significant impacts of overbearing or overshadowing. In addition, the extension proposes no glazing to face towards this neighbouring property, therefore, no increased detriment to neighbouring privacy is posed.

The proposed single storey rear extension is also considered to pose no significant impacts of overbearing or overshadowing, a result of its minimal projection and single storey height. In addition, desktop calculations show the

proposed single storey rear extension to satisfy the 45-degree rule as set out in the adopted House Extensions and Alterations SPD. The extension proposes no glazing to face towards this neighbouring property, therefore, no increased detriment to neighbouring privacy is posed.

No. 94 Rowley Lane – this property is located to the east of the application site.

The proposed single storey extensions to No. 92, front and rear, are not considered to pose detrimental levels of overbearing or overshadowing, as a result of their projections, retained seperation from the shared boundary. In addition, these extensions propose no glazing to face towards this neighbouring property, therefore, no increased detriment to neighbouring privacy is posed.

The proposed two-storey extensions are also considered acceptable from a residential amenity perspective, with the higher topographical ground level of No. 94 mitigating against any significant detriment from overbearing or overshadowing. For reasons of being set to the height of the existing dwellinghouse, the two-storey side extension poses no significant increase in potential overshadowing. In addition, sunlight calculator software has been used to confirm that potential overshadowing from the two-storey rear extension will be limited to between the hours of 16:00-19:00 in the summer and 14:00-15:45 in the winter. It should also be noted that these hours of potential overshadowing are predominantly to the rear garden of No. 94 rather than the domestic dwelling itself.

In addition, the two-storey extensions propose no glazing to the side elevation. As a result, no increased potential of overlooking will be caused as a result of there erection, retaining acceptable levels of residential privacy.

For these reasons, the proposed developments at 92 Rowley Lane are not considered to cause undue harm to the residential amenities of neighbouring properties. It is therefore considered that the proposed development complies with Chapter 12 of the NPPF, LP24 of the Kirklees Local Plan and Key Design Principles 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7 of the Council's adopted House Extensions and Alterations SPD.

3. Impact on Highway Safety

Policies LP21 and LP22 of the Kirklees Local Plan relate to access and highway safety and are considered to be relevant to the consideration of this application. The Council's adopted Highway Design Guide and Key Design Principle 15 of the adopted House Extensions & Alterations SPD which seek to ensure acceptable levels of off-street parking are retained are also considered to be of relevance.

The number of bedrooms at 92 Rowley Lane could potentially increase to four given the additional space provided. There are two spaces to the front already provided and which would remain. For four bedroom properties 3 spaces are

recommended to be provided. In this case there is potential to create further parking to the front although it is considered that the beneficial impact of the existing planting / vegetation and fact there is not considered to be significant on street parking demand, it is not considered necessary for a condition requiring a scheme detailing how three off street spaces would be provided in this case.

As such, appropriate levels of on-site parking are considered to be retained, with parking amenity space provided to the front elevation of the dwelling with appropriate areas for on-street parking are available within the wider streetscene.

The existing route of vehicular access to and from 92 Rowley Lane will remain the same following the erection of the proposed extensions.

In turn, erecting the proposed extensions at 92 Rowley Lane is considered acceptable having regard to policies within Chapter 9 of the NPPF, LP21 and LP22 of the Kirklees Local Plan, the Highways Design Guide and Key Design Principle 15 of the House Extension SPD.

4. Other Matters

Land Stability

Policy LP53 of the Kirklees Local Plan and paragraphs 174 and 183 of the National Planning Policy Framework are relevant which seek to ensure that a site is suitable for its new use taking account of ground conditions and land instability, including from natural hazards or former activities such as mining, pollution arising from previous uses and any proposals for mitigation.

The application site falls within an area at High risk of ground movement as a result of past mining activities as determined by the Coal Authority. Whilst falling within a high risk area the Coal Authority identify the development type as that which does not need submission of a Coal Mining Risk Assessment. As such it is considered that it is unnecessary in this case to require a survey of land stability to be carried out with regard to previous mining activity which may have taken place within the locality. It is recommended that the Coal Authority's standing advice is provided with any grant of approval. As such it is considered that the proposal is acceptable with regard to ground stability in accordance with policy LP53 and paragraphs 174 and 183 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Climate Change

Principle 8 of the Kirklees House Extensions and Alterations SPD states that extensions and alterations should, where practicable, maximise energy efficiency. Principle 9 goes on to highlight that the use of innovative construction materials and techniques, including reclaimed and recycled materials should be used where possible. Furthermore, Principles 10 and 11

request that extensions and alterations consider the use of renewable energy and designing water retention into the proposals.

On 12th November 2019, the Council adopted a target for achieving 'net zero' carbon emissions by 2038, with an accompanying carbon budget set by the Tyndall Centre for Climate Change Research. National Planning Policy includes a requirement to promote carbon reduction and enhance resilience to climate change through the planning system and these principles have been incorporated into the formulation of Local Plan policies. The Local Plan predates the declaration of a climate emergency and the net zero carbon target; however, it includes a series of policies which are used to assess the suitability of planning applications in the context of climate change. When determining planning applications, the Council will use the relevant Local Plan policies and guidance documents to embed the climate change agenda.

Considering the small-scale of the proposed development, it is considered that the proposed development would not have an impact on climate change that needs mitigation to address the climate change emergency. The proposed development would therefore comply with Chapter 14 of the NPPF, Policy LP51 of the Kirklees Local Plan and Key Design Principle 8 of the Council's House Extensions and Alterations SPD.

5. Representations

No representations were received.

6. Conclusion

The NPPF has introduced 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.

This application has been assessed against relevant policies in the development plan and other material considerations. It is considered that the development would constitute sustainable development and is therefore recommended for approval.

Recommendation: Approve
Decision Authorisation – Delegated Powers
Application Number: 2022/90608
Officer Recommendation: Approve

Conditions and Reasons:

1. The development hereby permitted shall be begun within three years of the date of this permission.
Reason: Pursuant to the requirements of Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in complete accordance with the plans and specifications schedule listed in this decision notice, except as may be specified in the conditions attached to this permission, which shall in all cases take precedence.
Reason: For the avoidance of doubt as to what is being permitted and so as to ensure the satisfactory appearance of the development on completion, and to accord with Policies LP1, LP2, LP21, LP22, LP23, LP24 and LP35 of the Kirklees Local Plan, Principles 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11 and 15 of the Council's adopted House Extensions and Alterations SPD and policies within Chapters 2, 12, 14 and 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

3. The external walls and roofing materials of the extensions hereby approved shall in all respects match those used in the construction of the existing building and be thereafter retained.
Reason: In the interests of visual amenity and to accord with Policies LP2 and LP24 of the Kirklees Local Plan, Principles 1 and 2 of the Council's adopted House Extensions and Alterations SPD and policies within Chapter 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Note: the application site is located in a high risk coal area.

Plans and specifications schedule:-

Plan Type	**Reference**	**Version**	**Date Received**
Existing Plans and Elevations	0146_2021 – 01	-	21.2.22
Proposed Plans and Elevations	0146_2021 – 02	-	21.2.22
Proposed Attic Floor Plan	0146_2021 – 06	-	28.6.22

Pursuant to article 35 (2) of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) Order 2015 and guidance in the National Planning Policy Framework, the Local Authority have, where possible, made a pre-application advice service available, complied with the Kirklees Development Management Charter 2015 and otherwise actively engaged with the applicant in dealing with the application. The applicant submitted a set of written justifications in accordance with the Council's adopted House Extensions and Alterations SPD and submitted an attic floor plan upon the request of the case officer.

Report Dated: 22.7.22