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:	**2022/62/92409/W**
Site Address:	30, Holly Grove, Lindley, Huddersfield, HD3 3NS
Description:	Erection of extensions and alterations
Recommending Officer:	Ellie Worth

DECISION - Refuse

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: 06-Oct-2022

Site description
30 Holly Grove, Lindley is a detached two storey dwelling constructed from stone with a tiled roof. The building's design features include a projecting gable to the principal elevation and a single storey lean to, to the rear. Pedestrian and vehicular access can be taken from the northern boundary onto Holly Grove. To the front is a driveway and a landscaped area, along with private amenity space to the rear. Boundary treatment consists of timber fencing and hedging.

The site is situated within a wider residential area, whereby the neighbouring properties vary in design and form, however, the common construction material appears to be stone. The site is unallocated on the Kirklees Local Plan, however, the rear boundary is directly adjacent to Edgerton Conservation Area on the Kirklees Local Plan.

Description of development
Planning permission is sought for the erection of extensions and alterations. The measurements of the proposal are as follows:

Two storey front porch with lean to roof extending from existing dwelling:
- 4.2m in height to the eaves; 5.4m in overall height
- 2m in width
- 2m in projection

Two storey rear extension with shallow mono-pitched roof:
- 2.7m in projection
- 11.1m in width
- 5.5m in overall height

Flat roofed rear dormer:
- 9.4m in width
- 1.8m in height
- 3.1m in depth

The extensions would be constructed in stone to match the materials used on the host property. The dormer would be finished in a grey UPVC clad.

Internally the works would create additional living accommodation, including a master suite within the roof.

History of negotiations/amendments received
No negotiations or amendments have been sought as the rear extension is considered wholly unacceptable from a design perspective, with the site already benefiting from an extant permission for similar development.

Relevant Planning History
At the application site:

- 2021/92598 – Erection of extensions and alterations – Granted on 29th March 2022.

Representations
The application has been advertised by site notice, neighbour notification letters and the press.

Final publicity expires: 26th August 2022
As a result of the above publicity, no representations have been received.

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).

The site is without notation on the Kirklees Local Plan but is adjacent to Edgerton Conservation Area.

Kirklees Local Plan:
- LP 1 – Achieving sustainable development
- LP 2 – Place shaping
- LP 21 – Highway safety
- LP 22 – Parking
- LP 24 – Design
- LP 30 – Biodiversity
- LP 35 – Historic environment
- LP51 – Protection and improvement of local air quality

Supplementary planning documents (SPD)
- House Extensions and Alterations
- Highways Design Guide

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 14 – Meeting the Challenge of Climate Change, Coastal Change and Flooding
- Chapter 15 – Conserving and enhancing the natural environment
- Chapter 16 – Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

Assessment

The following matters are considered in the assessment below –
1.Principle of development
2.Impact on visual amenity (including impact upon historic environment)
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 notation on the Kirklees Local Plan. Policy LP1 of the Kirklees Local Plan 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 of the KLP goes on further to state 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''.

With regard to the House Extensions and Alterations SPD, when proposing to extend a property, sub paragraph 4.1 states that:

The council will encourage proposals for house extensions and alterations to implement the key design principles set out below relating to development context, character and the relationship with the built and natural environment. Proposals should aim to achieve a balance between these principles to create sustainable, well-designed extensions and alterations which will have a positive impact on the quality of life for both occupiers and neighbours.

Background
The previous application 2021/92598 for extensions and alterations is a material consideration in which establishes the principle of having a two storey front extension and rear extension. Therefore, the main changes to this application are the alteration to the proposed roof form on the rear extension and the erection of a new dormer.

Therefore, the principle of development could be supported, but this is subject to an assessment on all other material planning considerations including visual and residential amenity and highways safety below.

2. Impact on visual amenity and heritage

Policies LP1, LP2 and LP24 of the Kirklees Local Plan are all relevant, as these policies seek to achieve good quality design that retains a sense of local identify, which is in keeping with the scale of development within the area and is visually attractive. With reference to extensions, it is advised within Policies LP24(c) that these *"are subservient to the original building and are in keeping*

with the existing building in terms of scale, materials and details and minimise the impact on residential amenity of future and neighbouring occupiers."

These aims are also reinforced within Chapter 12 of the NPPF (Achieving well designed plans) where paragraph 126 provides an overarching consideration of design stating that *"the creation of high-quality buildings and places are 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."*

With regard to the House Extensions and Alterations SPD, Key Design Principles 1 and 2 are relevant which state:
• Principle 1 - 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."*
• Principle 2 - 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."*

In this case, the application proposes to erect a front porch, extend the dwelling by two storeys to the rear, erect a rear dormer and to insert a side window within the eastern facing elevation. The additional works would make the host property more prominent within the street scene, however the front porch extension would be similar to those that already exist on some of the surrounding properties. The flat roof rear extension and rear dormer on the other hand would impact upon the visual aesthetics of the site but would not lead to its overdevelopment. Nonetheless, each element will be discussed in more detail below, with regard to Section 5 of the House Extensions and Alteration SPD too which provides guidance on specific extensions and alterations.

<u>Front porch/tower:</u>
Section 5.2 of the House Extensions and Alterations SPD relates to front extensions, with Paragraphs 5.13 and 5.14 stating the following:

"Front extensions are highly prominent in the street scene and can erode the character of the area if they are not carefully designed. Large extensions (single and two-storey) and conservatories on the front of an existing house are likely to appear particularly intrusive and will not normally be acceptable.

Single storey extensions on the front of a house and two-storey or first floor front extensions are usually unacceptable due to the impact on the character of the area and visual amenity and will not normally be permitted unless:

- *The house is set well back from the pavement or is well screened; and*
- *The extension is small, subservient to the original building, well-designed and would not harm the character of the original house or the area; and*
- *The materials and design match the existing features of the original house; and*

- *The extension would not unreasonably affect the neighbouring properties."*

In this instance, Officers have noted that there would be no changes to the front extension, when compared to the works approved as part of the extant 2021 permission (ref: 2021/92598). As such, the original assessment is still considered valid and has been reiterated below.

In this instance, Officers have noted that similar built form already appears to exist on neighbouring properties. Therefore, given the size and scale of the development proposed and the fact that it would harmonise with the character of the area, no concerns have been raised. The materials would also be stonework to match.

In terms of fenestration, a large opening is proposed within the front elevation. This has been designed to add a contemporary feel to the extension and there are no concerns with regard. At ground floor a new pedestrian door is proposed''

Therefore, given the relatively small size and scale of this feature, Officers do not have significant concerns from a visual amenity perspective.

Two storey rear extension:
Section 5.1 of the House Extensions and Alterations SPD provides guidance for rear extensions. Paragraphs 5.1 and 5.2 within this section of the SPD provide general advice on rear extensions, stating that:

"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."*

Paragraphs 5.8-5.10 of the aforementioned SPD go on to provide specific guidance on two storey rear extensions, with Paragraph 5.8 stating that:

"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."*

In this instance, the extension would be proportionate to the size of the building and would only project out from the rear of the building by 2.7m, with the existing single storey lean to being demolished. The extension would be set in from the western boundary by approximately 2.2m but would fall short of the 1.5m identified within the guidance to the east, as this would be in set by 1m. However, given that the existing property already has this relationship with the neighbouring property, it would result in a poor visual finish if the extension was to be inset by an additional 0.5m. Therefore, any impact can be supported. It should also be noted that the rear extension already approved at the site would be flush with the side walls

However, with regards to design and form, significant concerns have been raised, as the extension is proposed, broadly, to have a flat roof. This would result in an incongruous feature within the application site and would not harmonise well with the existing property nor the neighbouring built form, unlike the extant permission in which proposed a pitched roof. Therefore, Officers consider the design to be based on function rather than form and good design.

Furthermore, of relevance to this is Paragraph 135 of the NPPF, which states that *"Local planning authorities should seek to ensure that the quality of approved development is not materially diminished between permission and completion, as a result of changes being made to the permitted scheme."* In this case, it is considered that to permit such scheme would result in a poor level of development which would be contrary to the aims of Policy LP24 of the KLP, Principles 1 and 2 of the House Extensions and Alterations SPD and Chapter 12 of the NPPF.

In terms of fenestration double doors have been proposed at ground floor, with additional windows at first floor. The design of these have been considered acceptable and therefore can be supported.

Materials would be to match the existing property.

<u>Rear dormer</u>

Section 5.4 of the House Extensions and Alterations SPD provides specific advice on dormer windows and roof extensions. Paragraphs 5.24-5.26 within the section state the following:

"Roofs are a prominent and visible element of the street scene. Unsympathetic roof extensions and dormer windows can have a significant effect on the visual appearance of both the individual building and street scene. Poorly designed roof extensions and dormer windows can make a building appear top-heavy, cluttered and asymmetrical.

The design of dormer windows and roof extensions should reflect the character of the area, the surrounding buildings and the age, appearance and materials of the existing house. Ideally, dormers should be located to the rear of a house and should be as small as possible with a substantial area of the original roof retained…

…Traditional vertical dormer windows usually complement the character and roof pitch of the existing house and will normally be acceptable. Modern flat roof dormers may be considered acceptable if they are well-designed, small in scale and appearance and are characteristic of the street scene."

In this case, the rear dormer would extend across the majority of the rear roof slope. Whilst a rear dormer of this size could potentially be constructed under permitted development, it has been noted that in this case, the dormer would not be set up from the eaves by 0.2m. Therefore, Officers hold the view that this design would fail to comply with the GDPO.

Materials would be dark grey cladding to match the tiles in which exist on the host property. Despite this, Officers still have concerns regarding the overall bulk of the dormer. Of note, it would cover most of the existing rear roof slope and would be a sizeable element. It is considered that this flat roof dormer would dominate the rear roof slope contrary to advice within the House Extensions and Alterations SPD and would result in an incongruous addition to the dwelling and would fundamentally alter its.

In addition to this, it is considered that this sizeable flat dormer in combination with the flat roof roofed two storey extension would appear haphazard and would appear incompatible with the design of the existing dwelling, thereby causing detrimental harm to the character of the original house and area.

<u>External alterations</u>
The submitted plans show a new window to be inserted into the eastern facing side elevation of the host property. This has been approved as part of the extent permission and therefore no significant concerns are raised, as it would have a similar design finish to the windows that exist on the host dwelling.

<u>Historic Environment</u>
Alongside the above, the application has been assessed by the impact it would have on the character and setting of Edgerton Conservation Area, as the rear boundary would be directly adjacent to it.

Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings & Conservation Area) Act (1990) requires that LPA's pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of any conservation area where relevant.

Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Building & Conservation Areas) Act (1990) is mirrored in Policy LP35 of the Kirklees Local Plan and Chapter 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Furthermore, Policy LP35 of the Kirklees Local Plan states that: *"Development proposals affecting a designated heritage asset…should preserve or enhance the significance of the asset. In cases likely to result in substantial harm or loss, development will only be permitted where it can be demonstrated that the proposals would bring substantial public benefits that clearly outweigh the harm*

In this case, given the flat roof design of the rear extension, it has been considered that it would result in a poor visual finish, which in turn, would not keep in with the architectural merits of the host property and surrounding built form. As outlined above, the sizeable rear dormer is considered to cause further harm to the character of property, and these elements in combination are considered to result in a haphazard finish. It is therefore considered that the proposal would cause less than substantial harm to the significance of this adjacent conservation area. No public benefits have been provided by the applicant to outweigh such harm in line with Paragraph 202 of the NPPF. It is therefore considered that the proposal would fail to accord with Policy LP35 of the KLP and Chapter 16 of the NPPF.

Having taken into account the above, officers consider the flat roof rear extension to result in an incongruous feature within the application site, relating poorly to the host property. To approve the development would be contrary to LP24 of the KLP, Chapters 1 and 2 of the House Extensions and Alterations SPD and Paragraph 135 of the NPPF.

3. 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.

The House Extensions and Alterations SPD sets out a number of design principles which will need to be considered when assessing a proposals impact on residential amenity, which state:

- Principle 3 - that *"extensions and alterations should be designed to achieve reasonable levels of privacy for both inhabitants, future occupants, and neighbours."*

- Principle 4 - 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."*
- Principle 5 - that *"extensions and alterations should not adversely affect the amount of natural light presently enjoyed by a neighbouring property."*
- Principle 6 - that *"extensions and alterations should not unduly reduce the outlook from a neighbouring property."*
- Principle 7 - that *"extensions and alterations should ensure an appropriately sized and useable area of private outdoor space is retained. Normally at least half the garden area should be retained as part of the proposals."*

With regards to residential amenity, No's. 11, 28 and 32 Holly Grove and no. 8 West Avenue are the nearest residential properties to the application site.

28 Holly Grove

No. 28 is the neighbouring property in which is situated to the west. It has been noted that there would be no material impact upon these neighbour's amenity as a result of the front porch/tower, as it would be obscured to some degree, by the existing garage.

With regards to the rear extension and rear dormer, there would be some additional built form, however, this is unlikely to have a detrimental impact upon these neighbour's rear openings or their outdoor garden space due to the orientation of these properties with one another.

In terms of overshadowing, this would only be visible within a morning, with the main impact being from the host dwelling itself. Therefore, given the above and that an adequate outlook would be retained, no significant concern is raised.

Lastly, in terms of overlooking from the extension and dormer, the submitted plans show no new windows to be proposed within the side elevation of the rear extension or the cheeks of the dormer. Future first floor side openings would be controlled under the GPDO and any outlook from future ground floor openings would be mitigated by the existing boundary hedge. As such, this relationship can be supported by officers.

32 Holly Grove

32 Holly Grove is the neighbouring property to the east of the application site. It has been noted that there would be no material impact as a result of the front porch/tower. This is due to the nearest built form at these neighbours being their integral garage, along with a separation distance of 6.8m.

To the rear, it has been noted that these neighbours are situated slightly further back into their plot. As such, the two storey rear extension would only project beyond these neighbours rear elevation by ~1.3m and therefore, Officers are satisfied that there would be no undue overshadowing or overbearing. The rear dormer is also unlikely to result in any additional impact over and above what

has been previously approved, as it would be smaller in-built form than the pitched roofs on the rear extension.

In terms of overlooking, the submitted plans show no new windows to be inserted into the eastern facing side elevation of the two story extension or the cheek of the dormer. However, due to the slight change in levels and the close proximity of the works to these neighbours, Officers in the case of approval, would have considered it necessary to remove permitted development rights for future ground floor windows. First floor side openings would be controlled under the GPDO.

Lastly, it has been noted that the plans propose to insert a new side opening within the eastern facing side elevation of the host dwelling, at first floor. Whilst this would not have a direct impact upon these neighbour's amenity, due to their western elevation being blank and the opening being at an oblique angle with their outdoor amenity space, Officers consider the opening to have the potential to restrict any future development at these neighbours, especially, if they wanted to extend above the existing garage/lean to. Therefore, as outlined on the extant permission and in the case of an approval, a condition would have been attached to the decision notice to state that this window is to be fitted with obscure glazing. This is to comply with Policy LP24 of the KLP and Principle 3 of the SPD.

<u>8 West Avenue</u>
8 West Avenue is the neighbouring property to the rear of the application site. There would be no further impact upon these neighbour's amenity as a result of the front extension. However, the built form would also be intensified to the rear of the site to include a dormer and rear extension. Nevertheless, a separation distance of 17m would be retained to these neighbours nearest rear elevation, from the two storey extension. As a result, there would be no detrimental overbearing, overshadowing or overlooking by the development proposed.

<u>11 Holly Grove</u>
11 Holly Grove is the neighbouring property to the north of the application site. It has been noted that a separation distance of 20m would be retained from these neighbours projecting gable to the front porch, including a highway. As such, there would be no significant impact in terms of overbearing, overshadowing or overlooking, as the proposed tower/porch would be limited in size and scale and therefore would have minimal impact upon these neighbour's amenity.

There would also be no further impact from the two storey rear extension and rear dormer, as this is located to the south of the application site.

It is therefore considered that the proposal is acceptable in terms of residential amenity and would accord with Policy LP24 of the Kirklees Local Plan, principles 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7 of the Council's adopted House Extensions & Alterations SPD and policies within the National Planning Policy Framework.

4.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. Principle 16 of the House Extensions and Alterations SPD also sets out that extensions and alterations should maintain appropriate storage arrangements for waste.

In this case, whilst the proposal has the potential to intensify the built form at the site, Officers have noted that three off street parking spaces would be retained on the existing driveway. Therefore, despite the integral garage already of being subdivided, an acceptable level of on-site parking would be retained. Waste arrangements are unlikely to change. This is therefore considered to accord with Policies LP21 and LP22 of the KLP, Chapter 9 of the NPPF and the aims of the Highways Design Guide SPD and Principles 15 and 16 House Extensions and Alterations SPD.

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 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.

Principles 8-11 of the House Extensions and Alterations SPD relate to planning for climate change. Of note:

- Principle 8 (Energy Efficiency) states: *"Extensions and alterations should, where practicable, maximise energy efficiency."*
- Principle 9 (Construction Materials) states: *"Extensions and alterations should seek to use innovative construction materials and techniques, including reclaimed and recycled materials where possible."*
- Principle 10 (Renewable Energy) states: *"Extensions and alterations should consider the use of renewable energy."*
- Principle 11 (Water Retention) states: *"Extensions and alterations should consider designing water retention into the proposals."*

In this case, due to the nature of the proposal, it is not considered reasonable to require the applicant to put forward any specific resilience measures. However, it has been noted that the extension would be constructed from stone,

which is considered to be natural material that can be sourced locally. The use of additional openings to habitable rooms would also reduce the need of artificial lighting and improve solar passive gain.

Bats

Chapter 15 of the NPPF relates to conserving and enhancing the Natural Environment. Paragraph 179 of the NPPF outlines that decisions should promote the protection and recovery of priority species and identify and pursue opportunities for securing net gains for biodiversity. Paragraph 180 goes on to note that if significant harm to biodiversity resulting from development cannot be avoided, adequately mitigated, or, as a last resort, compensated for, then planning permission should be refused.

Policy LP30 of the Kirklees Local Plan echoes the NPPF in respect of biodiversity. Policy LP30 outlines that development proposals should minimise impacts on biodiversity and provide net biodiversity gains through good design by incorporating biodiversity enhancements and habitat creation where opportunities exist.

Further to this, Principle 12 of the House Extensions and Alterations SPD states that: *"Extensions and alterations should consider how they might contribute towards the enhancement of the natural environment and biodiversity."*

In this instance, the application site lies within the bat alert layer on the Council's GIS system. As such, careful attention has been paid when looking for evidence of bat roof potential. In this instance, the property appeared well sealed around the eaves and roof area and it was judged unlikely to contain roosting bats.

Nonetheless, in the case of an approval, a note would be added to the decision notice stating that if bats are found development shall cease and the advice of a licenced bat worker sought. This is to accord with the aims of Chapter 15 of the NPPF. It is not considered proportionate in this instance to seek biodiversity net gains.

6. Representations

No representations have 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.

Policy LP2 of the Kirklees Local Plan sets out that all proposals should address challenges identified in the Local Plan, with Policy LP24 of the plan stating that good design should be at the core of all proposals in the district.

This application has been assessed against relevant policies in the development plan and other material considerations. It is considered that the development would not constitute sustainable development and is therefore recommended for refusal.

Recommendation: Refuse

Decision Authorisation: Delegated Powers
Application Number: 2022/92409
Officer Recommendation: Refuse

Reasons for Refusal:

1. The two storey flat roof rear extension, by virtue of its flat roof design, would fail to sympathetically relate to or respect the host dwelling's original built form. In addition to this, the sizeable flat roof dormer, would dominate the rear roof slope of the existing dwelling and would result in incongruous addition to the dwelling. The two storey rear extension and rear dormer in combination would also result in a haphazard finish to the rear of the dwelling out of character with the original house. The development would thereby result in a discordant and incongruous addition to the host dwelling, constituting an unsympathetic form of development. The proposal would thereby cause detrimental harm the character and appearance of the area and less than substantial harm to the significance of the Edgerton Conservation Area. No public benefits have been demonstrated which outweigh the harm to the significance of the conservation area. The proposal is therefore contrary Policies LP24 (a and c) and LP35 of the Kirklees Local Plan, Principles 1 and 2 of the Council's adopted House Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document and Government guidance contained within Chapters 12 (including Paragraph 135) and 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Plans and specifications schedule:

Plan Type	Reference	Version	Date Received
Location plan	GA100	-	18th July 2022
Existing floor plans and elevations	ST21.201-STSQ-A1-A-1101	-	18th July 2022
Proposed floor plans and elevations	ST21.201-STSQ-A1-A-1102	E	18th July 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 Planning 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. In this instance, no negotiations or amendments sought as the rear extension is considered wholly unacceptable from a design perspective.

Report Dated: 29th September 2022