

**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:	2022/62/92099/W
Site Address:	72, Meltham Road, Honley, Holmfirth, HD9 6HL
Description:	Erection of two storey side and rear and single storey rear extensions
Recommending Officer:	Tom Hunt

DECISION – REFUSED

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

Stuart Howden

AUTHORISED OFFICER

Date: 11-Nov-2022

Officer Report

Site Description

2022/92099 – 72, Meltham Road, Honley, Holmfirth, HD9 6HL

The application site relates to a two-storey, semi-detached property. Construction materials are natural stone with concrete grey tile and red ridge tile. It has been extended at the rear by ~5m with a projection protruding past the flank elevation which is roofed in a mix of styles and clad with timber and a stone base. There is a ground storey roof projecting ~2.5m from the host's rear functioning as shelter. In addition, there is a detached single-storey outbuilding sited further into the garden with a red brick base and timber cladding and a pitch roof.

It is bounded by natural stone walls to the front landscaped amenity space and has a driveway leading up past its flank elevation. To the rear is a good-sized garden with raised and lower patios.

The streetscene comprises previously extended houses with extensions to the rear and when present, two-storey side extensions typically flush at the primary elevation and built up to the flank boundary forming isolated examples of terracing. The boundary treatment is typically low stone walls to most houses providing a cohesive and pleasantly consistent street character. The paired neighbour has been extended with a flush two-storey side extension and a part single-storey rear extension with lean-to roof and two-storey rear extension with hipped roof.

It is not within a Conservation Area, not a Listed Building or within close proximity to a listed building.

Description of Proposal

Erection of two storey side and rear and single storey rear extensions

Extensions

It is proposed to have a two-storey side extension flush with the primary elevation, extending 2.15m from the side and ~7.8m depth with its hipped roof

matching the host ridge and eaves. This would retain a boundary separation gaps of ~0.9m for access to the rear garden.

An existing ground storey roof would be extended over the side extension's elevation ~7.1m width and of a hipped style.

To the rear, covering the host rear elevation and the two-storey side extension, there would be a two-storey extension projecting ~1.9m from the rear and ~7.6m width. It would have a hipped roof design set ~0.6m from the host ridge. This would project less than the paired neighbour's rear extension.

Also proposed, is a single-storey rear extension with a hipped roof extending 3.1m from the rear and spanning 7.6m width. The roof ridge height would be ~4.2m and the eaves ~3.1m from ground level. This would project ~2.45m forward of the paired neighbour's single-storey rear extension adjacent to double French glazed doors without the benefit of a separation distance to boundary. Cumulatively it would extend ~5m from the original rear elevation of the host.

Openings

The front door would be repositioned to be within the side extension and a new window would be formed where the doorway entrance previously was. A window to the first storey would be to match the host's existing at primary elevation.

To the flank elevation, three new windows would be formed to the ground floor of the host, and a partially glazed doorway and horizontal window would be inserted with its base at ~2.3m from ground level within the rear extension flank. One first floor window would be removed from the host building. To the rear, 4 new window openings to the first floor would be formed in loose pair groups and an off set bi-fold/glazed section would be to the ground floor. the single-storey roof would have 3 roof lights.

Additional details

This would serve a lobby, w.c. utility room and to extend the kitchen to have an open plan dining/living/kitchen space at ground floor. To first floor it would add a bedroom newly forming a 4 bed property with a new ensuite.

Proposed materials would be natural stone with concrete tile to its roofs. No parking layout has been supplied to confirm parking arrangements which would suggest they would utilise the remaining driveway space to the front sufficient for one car.

History of negotiations/amendments received

Officers considered the application on review and sought to have the scheme reduced and to match the paired neighbour to meet LP policies on visual and residential amenity. The agent submitted a scheme which appeared not too dissimilar to the initial proposal, as well as a Planning Statement.

The Planning Statement discusses a history of the street history covering extensions which were carried out prior to the adoption of the House Extensions and Alterations SPD. It states that the two-storey side extension would be, on this basis, in keeping with the street scene.

Officers advised to reduce the scheme at the rear.

The Planning Statement notes that the single-storey rear extension would fall under Permitted Development, but Officers disagree with this argument and therefore attribute extremely limited weight. Of note, the proposed rear extension would not meet the thresholds set out in the GPDO, by reason of it extending past the flank elevation of the host. The possibility of a 2m boundary fence was raised as normally available under Permitted Development however the proposal would be of a higher height with greater impacts adjacent to double French doors (to be fully assessed in the residential amenity section).

The Planning Statement on to state that the proposed extension would have a smaller floor area than that of the original building which reviewing the original property on historic maps and evidence available to the Local Planning Authority, does not appear to be accurate.

The Planning Statement goes on to state that the design would be more aesthetically pleasing than the existing arrangement which would be reviewed within the visual amenity section of the report. The said proposal was held to be similar and smaller than a proposal approved in 2015 but does not state where this is. Given this and that the Kirklees Local Plan, Housebuilders Design Guide SPD and National Design Guide have been introduced since to improve design amongst other planning material considerations, this limits the weight that can be ascribed to this argument from the agent.

Following discussions, the agent wished to proceed on the basis of the submitted plans to appeal the recommended refusal at a later stage. The Officer requested a parking layout or justification for the loss of the parking space to ensure that the agent was able to fully represent their case to be considered. The Officer also assisted in optimising the proposed layout but had to submit the report to meet the revised target date in time.

Relevant Planning History

No previous planning applications for this site.

74 Meltham Road

2002/93314 – Erection of Ground Floor Extension – Approved on 11/11/2002

2004/90788 – Erection of First Floor and Single Storey Extensions – Approved on 14th April 2004.

Post House Extensions and Alterations SPD adoption

2022/92991 – 62, Meltham Road, Honley, Holmfirth, HD9 6HL – Erection of single storey rear extension and first floor side extension and alterations. Approved on 31st October 2022.

Officer Note: This was for a much smaller proposal than subject of this current application before members. The two-storey side extension is proposed to be set back half the depth of the host from the primary elevation, and is of a limited depth (whilst not projecting beyond the rear wall of the original dwelling)

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 3rd August 2022

No representations have been received.

New plans were not re-advertised as they had reduced the bulk and massing of the design somewhat however the proposal's design was not changed substantially to reflect the feedback from Officers. While the two-storey rear extension was reduced from 2.5m projection from the rear, the full extent of the single-storey rear extension remained at 5m from the rear of the host.

Consultation Responses

Holme Valley Parish Council – Support subject to sufficient parking provision

Policy

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) and the Holme Valley Neighbourhood Development Plan adopted 8th December 2021.

The site is within the Holme Valley Neighbourhood Plan under Local Character Area 6, this being 'Honley Village Centre'.

The site is otherwise unallocated on the Kirklees Local Plan. It is within a Low Coal Risk Area.

Kirklees Local Plan (LP):

- LP 1 – Presumption in favour of sustainable development
- LP 2 – Place shaping
- LP 3 – Location of new development

- LP 21 – Highways and access
- LP 22 – Parking
- LP 24 – Design
- LP 30 – Biodiversity and geodiversity
- LP 51 – Protection and improvement of local air quality

HVNDP Policies relevant to this application are:

- Policy 1: Protecting and Enhancing the Landscape Character of Holme Valley
- Policy 2: Protecting and Enhancing the Built Character of the Holme Valley and Promoting High Quality Design
- Policy 11: Improving Transport, Accessibility and Local Infrastructure
- Policy 12: Promoting Sustainability
- Policy 13: Protecting Wildlife and Securing Biodiversity Net Gain

Supplementary Planning Guidance

- Kirklees Highways Design Guide SPD
- Kirklees House Extensions and Alterations SPD
- Waste Management Design Guide for New Developments (Oct 2020, v.5)

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, the Planning Practice Guidance Suite (PPGS) first launched 6th March 2014 together with Circulars, Ministerial 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 4 – Decision-Making
- Chapter 9 – Promoting Sustainable Transport
- Chapter 12 – Achieving Well-Designed places
- Chapter 13 – Protecting Green Belt Land
- Chapter 14 – Meeting the Challenge of Climate Change, Coastal Change and Flooding
- Chapter 15 – Conserving and Enhancing the Natural Environment

Assessment

The following matters are considered in the assessment below –

- 1) Principle of development
- 2) Impact on visual amenity
- 3) Impact on residential amenity
- 4) Impact on highway safety
- 5) Other matters – e.g. trees/ecology

- 6) Representations
- 7) Conclusion

1 – Principle of development:

The site is without notation on the Kirklees Local Plan. Policy LP1 states that when considering development proposals, the Council will take a positive approach that reflects the presumption in favour of sustainable development contained in the National Planning Policy Framework. Policy LP1 goes on further to stating that:

“The Council will always work pro-actively with applicants jointly to find solutions which mean that the proposal can be approved wherever possible, and to secure development that improves the economic, social and environmental conditions in the area.”

In addition, Policies within LP24 of the Local Plan and Chapter 12 of the NPPF will guide the proposal’s impact on achieving good design. In this case, it could potentially be acceptable, subject to the assessment of impacts on visual and residential amenity and highway safety, as well as other matters which will be discussed below.

2 –Impact on visual amenity:

In terms of visual amenity, general design considerations are set out in Policy LP24 of the Local Plan, the 'House Extensions and Alterations SPD' and Chapter 12 of the NPPF, which seek to secure good design in all developments by ensuring that they respect and enhance the character of the townscape and protect amenity.

LP24 of the Kirklees Local Plan requires extensions to be subservient to the original building and to be in keeping with the existing buildings in terms of scale, materials and details.

Policy 1 of the HVNDP relates to protecting and enhancing the landscape character of Holme Valley, and states that: *“All development proposals should demonstrate how they have been informed by the characteristics of the Landscape Character Area (LCA) in which they are located”*. The Policy goes on to note that proposals should be designed in accordance with the character and management principles in respect of landscape set out for each LCA in order to avoid detrimental impact on the LCA (LCA6).

The Local Character Area makes reference to the rural and semi-rural qualities of Honley Village Centre seeking to retain views and specific mention of the southwest of Honley is referred to as having *“more eclectic architecture with largely 20th century residential properties...These are generally in-keeping with the historic townscape due to scale and use of traditional materials.”*

Policy 2 of the HVNDP states that new development should protect and enhance local built character and distinctiveness, strengthen the local sense of place by respecting the existing grain of development in the surrounding area, use local materials and detailing which add to the quality or character of the surrounding environment, respect the scale, mass, height and form of existing buildings in the locality and their setting. Furthermore, this policy sets

out that development should sit in with and neither dominate or have a detrimental; impact on its surroundings and neighbouring properties. Principle 1 of the Kirklees House Extensions and Alterations SPD states that extensions and alterations to residential properties should be in keeping with the appearance, scale, design and local character of the area and the street scene. In addition, Principle 2 of this SPD states that extensions should not dominate or be larger than the original house and should be in keeping with the existing building in terms of scale, materials and detail. Principle 13 of this SPD (Vegetation and tree planting) is also considered relevant. Section 5 of this SPD provides advice on specific types of extensions and alterations.

Side Extension

Section 5.3 of the House Extensions and Alterations relates to side extensions. It states that:

“Side extensions should be located and designed to minimise the impact on the local character of the area. The design should reflect the design of the original building in terms of roof style, pitch materials and detailing...

Two-storey side extensions can have a significant effect on the character of the original house and the street. Adequate space between buildings should be retained to provide a sense of space which is important to the character of an area.

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; and
- be set back at least 500mm from the front wall of the house”

The proposed side extension element would not conform to the SPD guidance of being visually smaller than the host nor set back 0.5m from the front wall to have a design that is clearly subservient. This is due to a similar front wall line and eaves and ridge height. That said, it is noted that it would still have a property boundary gap near to 1m. Whilst this is considered unfortunate, this extension in isolation could potentially be acceptable given that the attached neighbour had extended similarly to the side, and this would prevent an unbalanced design. In addition, the property gap and the elevated position of No. 72 would aid the design in avoiding undue terracing which has occurred between No's. 52 and 50 of the same road.

Part single/part two-storey rear extension

Section 5.1 of the House Extensions and Alterations SPD relates to rear extensions

It states the following:

“Rear extensions should maintain the quality of the residential environment and relate well to the neighbouring buildings. Rear extensions should generally not be visible from the street and should retain a reasonable living environment for the property being extended. This should include consideration of the following:

- *Preserving a back garden of a reasonable size, with a general principle that at least half the garden area is retained;*
- *Being set behind the original building, and not projecting beyond the sides; and*
- *Maintaining external access to the rear garden.”*

As a general rule, a rear extension should:

- *respect the original house and garden in terms of its size and scale;*
- *use appropriate materials which match or are similar in appearance to the original house; and*
- *not have an adverse impact by way of overshadowing or loss of outlook of neighbouring properties.”*

In terms of single storey rear extensions, this section of the SPD goes on further to state:

“Single storey rear extensions can have an adverse impact on neighbouring properties and gardens. Careful consideration should therefore be given to the design of these extensions to ensure their height and windows do not harm the privacy of neighbours.

Single storey 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 meters; and*
- *retain a gap of at least 1 metre from a property boundary, such as a wall, fence or hedge.”*

This section of the aforementioned SPD further provides specific guidance for two storey extensions, stating:

“Two-storey rear extensions will be considered based on the extent of overshadowing, loss of privacy and outlook. Generally, 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; and*
- *not adversely affect habitable room windows where they adjoin a neighbour's boundary."*

Furthermore, to the above, Section 5 also provides guidance on part two storey, part single storey extensions, outlining the following:

"Careful consideration should be given to the design of part two-storey, part single storey rear extensions to ensure the proportions reflect those of the original house and that they do not overlook, overshadow or dominate neighbouring properties and gardens.

Care needs to be taken to ensure that the placement of windows takes account of neighbouring gardens. A stepped extension where the single storey addition lies close to the neighbouring boundary helps reduce the impact on neighbours. If the site is level and the rear elevations of the dwellings are flush, a 3.0m depth is acceptable provided that the single storey extension is set a minimum of 1.0 metre away from neighbouring side boundary and the two-storey extension a minimum of 1.5 metre from the shared side boundary."

The proposed design of the two storey extension element would be full span of the host, and extended to cover the rear wall of the side extension too. This aspect in combination with the single storey rear extension which covers a similar width, would cumulatively project beyond the recommended depth for rear extensions advised in the SPD. It would also result in the rear extensions dominating and obscuring the existing rear wall of the property. Whilst, it is acknowledged that the next door neighbouring property has extended to the rear, the two storey element is not as large next door, being set off from the side boundary, and there is no single storey protrusion beyond this. The overall extension would protrude ~2.4 beyond the extension at No.76. The proposed rear extensions together are considered to be materially larger than what has been developed next door. In addition to this, these extensions were approved prior to the House Extensions and Alterations SPD, the NPPF, the Kirklees Local Plan and the National Design Guide, all of which stress the importance of good design.

The hipped roof design of the single storey element would be contrast to the next door neighbouring extension with a simple lean-to form, that would protrude further forward of this adding to an inharmonious and complicated design.

The large rear extensions, in combination with the relatively large two storey extension, would increase the amount of development to the original dwelling, and the proposal would dominate this original dwelling, which is considered to be contrary to Principles 1 and 2 of the House Extensions and Alterations SPD.

Whilst it is acknowledged the proposal would remove a poorly designed extension, this is only single storey in scale and sited to the rear of the dwelling. The extension to the property now proposed is considered to

dominate the original dwelling contrary to guidance and Policy LP24 of the KLP.

The canopy element to the front is considered acceptable as it would continue the existing canopy roof.

The proposal would also retain sufficient garden space, even with the retention of the detached outbuilding.

When considering Principle 1 of the House Extensions and Alterations SPD, the streetscene does have some relatively large extensions locally carried out previous to the adoption of the House Extensions and Alterations SPD and the Kirklees Local Plan as discussed further above. In addition, the cumulative extension in this case is considered to be larger than most of the existing extensions to dwellings in the locality.

Considering Principle 2 of the House Extensions and Alterations SPD and Policy 2 of the HVNDP, the cumulative extensions would have dominant additions made to the host, obscuring the side elevation and the rear completely with only the primary elevation left relatively exposed. It would be out of scale with its paired neighbour, protruding beyond their own extensions to have an unsympathetic, dominant and oppressive design to the original house and its paired neighbour.

Thus, it is considered that the proposed extensions together, given the overall massing and scale, form and design, would fail to represent a subservient addition to the host property or be in keeping with the host building. The proposal would introduce an unsympathetic, incongruous, complicated and dominant form of development. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy LP24 (a and c) of the Kirklees Local Plan, Principles 1 and 2 of the House Extensions and Alterations SPD, Policy 2 of the HVNDP and Government guidance contained within Chapter 12 of the NPPF.

3 – Impact on residential amenity:

Section B and C of Policy LP24 of the Kirklees Local Plan 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 2021 states that planning decisions should ensure that developments have a high standard of amenity for existing and future users.

Principle 3 of the Kirklees Householder Extensions and Alterations SPD sets out that extensions and alterations should be designed to achieve reasonable levels of privacy for both inhabitants, future occupants and neighbours. In addition, Principle 4 notes that extensions and alterations should consider the design and layout of habitable and non-habitable rooms to reduce conflict between neighbouring properties relating to privacy, light and outlook. Furthermore, Principle 5 states that extensions and alterations should not

adversely affect the amount of natural light presently enjoyed by a neighbouring property, and recommends that a horizontal 45 degree line from a neighbouring habitable room window is not breached. Principle 6 states extensions and alterations should not unduly reduce the outlook from a neighbouring property.

Policy 2(10) of the HVNDP sets out that proposals should be designed to minimise harmful impacts on general amenity for present and future occupiers of land and buildings.

The closest properties, which are most likely to be affected by the proposed development are considered the next door properties to the side at No. 74 (west and attached) and No. 70 (east) and the impact on these will be explored below. It is considered that the proposed development would be sited a sufficient distance away from any other neighbouring properties not referred to above so as to prevent undue harm to these properties in terms of loss of light, loss of privacy or overlooking, or the creation of an overbearing effect. Of note, the property to the rear is quite some distance away.

No. 74

The proposed two-storey side extension would have a relatively similar building line to the rear wall of the rear extension at this next door property. There would be a 45° field of view maintained to the neighbour's first floor window avoiding an undue tunnelling effect or impact on light or outlook between this proposed design and the existing part single-storey/two-storey rear extension of the neighbour.

For the single-storey rear extension, it would be sited at the shared boundary separated by a timber boundary fence which is ~1m directly adjacent to the French doors which serves a garden room and then is a partially scalloped at approx. 1.6m height from ground both reducing light levels and outlook and they fall from the property's rear to the north. While the hipped roof form would remove some of the bulk and massing, the forward protrusion of the extension by 2.44m would not fully achieve the 45° field of outlook from the French doors by a few degrees. Nonetheless considering the sun path and the position of the single-storey extension to the neighbour, this would only have a slight impact to the outlook and have a very restricted impact on overshadowing.

To the two rear extensions would have no windows facing directly towards this neighbour ensuring no harmful loss of privacy or overlooking. Views from the rear windows would be oblique ones similar to the existing arrangement.

No. 70

The proposed side and rear extensions would be closer to this neighbour by approximately 3.5m while retaining a somewhat of a gap to the boundary. The neighbour is on lower ground to the host with a roofed side porch entrance partially glazed, and a secondary first-floor window which is obscurely glazed. As such, despite the increased closeness and height of the bulk and massing

of the host at an elevated height, due to the minor glazing to the door and to the obscurely glazed window, there would be very restricted harm on outlook and overbearing.

There would be proposed ground floor windows and a partially glazed door facing the property with three windows ~1.85m height to base from ground level and one window's base ~2.4m height to base from ground looking towards the garden. The removal of the existing windows facing the garden for the proposed height of the horizontal window would ensure that this would offer an improvement in the existing relationship between those neighbours in term of overlooking or loss of privacy. The other ground floor windows would serve a lobby, W.C. and utility room which are non-habitable rooms, however considering the proximity of the W.C. to the neighbour's doorway, it would be necessary to have this window conditioned to be obscurely glazed to avoid undue loss of privacy or harmful overlooking should this be approved. The porch entrance would be on lower ground and has a fence to their shared boundary further restricting views, despite the closeness, the proposed windows would only have oblique views to this neighbour's partially glazed window which would ensure no undue harm on overlooking or loss of privacy.

Future Occupiers

With reference to Principle 7 of the House Extensions and Alterations SPD, the proposal would still retain an adequate outdoor private amenity space.

The proposal would therefore be in general conformance with LP24(b) and Principles 3-7 House Extensions and Alterations SPD in relation to residential amenity.

4 – Impact on highway safety:

Turning to highway safety, Policies LP21 and 22 of the Kirklees Local Plan and Principle 15 – Provision for parking and Principle 16 – Provision for waste storage of the adopted House Extensions and Alterations SPD have been considered along with the KC Highway Design Guide SPD and Chapter 9 of the NPPF.

The Highways Design Guide advises that new dwellings should have sufficient off street parking spaces to meet need and to ensure on street parking impact is limited.

For a 4 plus bedroom dwelling, it is advised that it should have three off street parking spaces. The proposal would have the removal of a parking space to the side of the property with a retained, limiting the amount of off street parking to the fore. The paired semi-detached neighbour has an integral garage within its side extension which aided it in providing some mitigation to their loss of parking at the time.

Officers discussed parking impacts with the applicant's agent and request submitted parking layout plans which were provided set out off street parking provision despite this loss. The revised plan now shows a section of

landscaped area to the front remaining providing off street parking for two cars. The Officer is dubious that this could be achieved safely within the limited widened access however parking on site for two cars could be dealt with by condition to set out parking to be approved by the LPA to progress the application should it be approved at a future date, with an adequate amount of landscaping to the front being retained to prevent the frontage being dominating hard-standing.

The property is to the southwest of Honley Village Centre approximately 7-10 minutes walk and is ~4 minutes walk to regular buses for public transport. In addition, there is a convenience store close by which would aid in reducing unnecessary journeys by car. Thereby, two off-street parking spaces could be acceptable for a development of this scale on balance.

Thus, subject to a condition, it is considered that such a proposal could prevent undue harm to highways safety.

5 – Other matters:

Climate Change

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 pre-dates 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, this includes Key Design Principles 8-11 of the SPD.

Due to the householder nature of the development proposed and the retained size of the garden, it is not considered that specific mitigation measures are required to facilitate this development. Given the improved Building Regulations setting out high requirements for insulation and energy efficiency, and the increased daylighting through rooflights, the proposal would be of benefit to the original building's energy efficiency and would contribute positively towards carbon reduction.

Drainage

The site is within a low probability Flood Risk Zone and therefore if Officers are so minded to approve the application, a condition would be placed to ensure that the additional parking spaces would be drained sufficiently and/or made permeable in accordance with Policy LP28 of the Kirklees Local Plan and the Highways Design Guide SPD.

Biodiversity

Whilst considering Biodiversity, Principle 12 – Natural environment, Principle 13 – Vegetation and tree planting of the 'House Extensions and Alterations SPD', and Policy 12 and 13 of the HVNDP in conjunction with LP 30 of the Kirklees Local Plan is relevant.

Whilst it is acknowledged that the site is not located within an identified bat alert area, the proposal's scale may require a condition to be placed to have a bird box to satisfy the above policies, had Officers considered this proposal to be acceptable.

6 – Representations:

No representations had been received.

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 means in practice.

This application has been assessed against relevant policies in the development plan and other material considerations. It is considered that the proposed development does not accord with the development plan and/or the adverse impacts of granting permission would significantly and demonstrably outweigh any benefits of the proposed development when assessed against policies in the NPPF and other material consideration.

Recommendation

Refuse

Decision Authorisation - Delegated Powers

Application Number: 2022/92099

Officer Recommendation: Refuse

Reasons

1. The proposed extensions cumulatively, by virtue of their overall massing and scale, form and design would fail to represent a subservient addition to the host property or respect the host dwelling's original built form. The proposal would introduce an unsympathetic, incongruous, complicated and dominant form of development that would detrimentally harm the character and appearance of the area and host building. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy LP24 (a and c) of the Kirklees Local Plan, Principles 1 and 2 of the Council's adopted House Extensions and Alterations SPD, Policy 2 of the Holme Valley Neighbourhood Development Plan and Chapter 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Plans and specifications schedule:-

Plan Type	Reference	Version	Date Received
Site Location Plan, Existing and Proposed Site Layout with parking	Title: Site Plans. Project No. 21181. Drawing No. 01.	C	02/11/2022
Existing Floor Plans and Roof Plan.	Title: Existing Plans & Elevations. Project No. 21181. Drawing No. 02.	B	06/09/2022
Existing Elevation Plans.	Title: Existing Plans & Elevations. Project No. 21181. Drawing No. 03.	B	06/09/2022
Proposed Floor Plans and Roof Plan.	Title: Proposed Plans. Project No. 21181. Drawing No. 04.	B	06/09/2022
Planning Statement	Planning Statement by DrawMyExtension.co.uk. Not dated.	Unamended	06/09/2022

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 was approached regarding the application's likely refusal following design advice given by Officers but

wished it to be determined on the basis of the submitted scheme. For the reason outlined above, the application has been refused.

Report Dated:

08/11/2022