

**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:	2023/62/90383/W
Site Address:	49, Longden Avenue, Beaumont Park, Huddersfield, HD4 5JE
Description:	Erection of single storey side extension and single storey porch extension
Recommending Officer:	Tom Hunt

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.

Teresa Harlow

AUTHORISED OFFICER

Date: 12-Apr-2023

HOUSEHOLDER DELEGATED REPORT

Application Number	2023/90383
Location	49, Longden Avenue, Beaumont Park, Huddersfield, HD4 5JE
Proposal	Erection of single storey side extension and single storey porch extension
Publicity end date	21/03/2023
Number of representations received	0
Kirklees Local Plan Allocation/Designation	Unallocated
Extension to Time (EoT)	Yes EoT Date: 14/04/2023
Recommendation	Conditional Full Permission

	NO	YES
Applicant a Council Member or Officer in Investment and Regeneration (Skills and Regeneration)	✓	
Contrary to previous decision	✓	
Called in by Ward Member	✓	
Significant number of representations received	✓	

If 'No' to all above, proceed with a fast track report

By indicating that the development proposal complies with relevant national and local policy and the 'House Extensions and Alterations' Supplementary Planning Document, the planning officer is taking into account the information submitted with the application, any previous relevant applications, observations

during any site visit, any comments received in connection with the application and any other considerations which are material to the decision.

Policy

National

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) July 2021
National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG)

- NPPF Chapter 2 – Achieving sustainable development
- NPPF Chapter 12 – Achieving well-designed places
- NPPF Chapter 14 – Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change
- NPPF Chapter 15 – Conserving and enhancing the natural environment

Local

Kirklees Local Plan (LP):

- **LP 1** – Achieving sustainable development
- **LP 2** – Place shaping
- **LP 21** – Highways and access
- **LP 22** – Parking
- **LP 24** – Design
- **LP 30** – Biodiversity and geodiversity

Supplementary Planning Document ‘House Extensions and Alterations’ (2021).

- Key design principle 1: Local character and street scene
- Key design principle 2: Impact on the original house
- Key design principle 3: Privacy
- Key design principle 4: Habitable rooms and side windows
- Key design principle 5: Overshadowing/loss of light
- Key design principle 6: Preventing overbearing impact
- Key design principle 7: Outdoor space
- Key design principle 8: Energy efficiency
- Key design principle 9: Construction materials
- Key design principle 10: Renewable energy
- Key design principle 11: Water retention
- Key design principle 12: Natural environment
- Key design principle 13: Vegetation and tree planting
- Key design principle 14: Drainage and flood risk
- Key design principle 15: Provision for parking
- Key design principle 16: Provision for waste storage
- Key design principle 17: Access for all users

	YES / NO	SUMMARY
Negotiations/Amendments during course of application	Yes	<p>It was requested that the side extension be set down and back to appear visually smaller. The applicants refused commenting that the SPD states that a set back 'should' not 'must' be achieved so it is not compulsory and the proposal relates to a bungalow. Further justification received adding in support that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Maintaining the existing line of the house would be less disruptive visually, especially as it is a single storey bungalow</i> • <i>The extension will be fronted with the existing stone to cause minimal change to character</i> • <i>Maintaining the existing roofline would allow the detailing and pitch materials to be aligned rather than visibly differing</i> • <i>Making the extension half a metre narrower will have a significant impact on the living space we have planned and how we can best utilise this.</i> <p>The Officer has incorporated those points in the report.</p>
Parish/Town Council comments sought (Kirkburton)	N/A	
Planning History	Yes	2017/94321 – Single-storey HHPD extension – Approved Planning application details Kirklees Council
Consultations required	N/A	

Assessment

The Kirklees SPD sets out that single storey side extensions should comply with certain dimensions set out at paragraph 5.17 on page 28 (and listed below) and if they do not, they need to be justified:

Single-storey side extensions should:	<u>Yes - COMPLY</u>	<u>No - JUSTIFY</u>
not extend more than two thirds of the width of the original house	Yes – the host is 11.7m wide and the proposed is ~7.4m wide	
not exceed a height of 4 metres		No – the proposed would be ~5.6m ridge height and ~2.9m eaves height from ground. This would be aligned with the host's own. It would have a set back from the flank property boundary and adjacent to a single-storey detached outbuilding to minimise its impact.
be set back at least 500mm from the original building line to allow for a visual break.		No – the proposed would have a front porch extension to break up the bulk and massing of the flush side extension.

The Kirklees SPD sets out that single storey front extensions should comply with certain dimensions set out at paragraph 5.14 on page 27 (and listed below) and if they do not, they need to be justified:

Front porch extensions on the front of a house [...] are usually unacceptable due to the impact on the character of the area and visual amenity and will not normally be permitted unless:	<u>Yes - COMPLY</u>	<u>No - JUSTIFY</u>
The house is set well back from the pavement or is well screened;	Yes – while the porch extension would be prominent on elevated ground, it would be set back an adequate ~15m and be partially obscured by its position at the end of a close	

The extension is small, subservient to the original building, well-designed and would not harm the character of the original house or the area	Yes – the extension would have a design visually smaller than the host with its minor gable end roof frontage and harmonised with matching materials. While its angled design would introduce an uncommon feature in the streetscene, a reduced design by floor area could be carried out under Permitted Development Rights.	
The materials and design match the existing features of the original house	Yes – the rear and front elevation of the side extension and the entire porch will be faced in stone with render used to the flank gable end to be a secondary material. Render is an existing secondary material to the host. The roof will be tiled to match the host.	

Design and Visual Amenity: Are the considerations in the following table acceptable?

The application property is located within a close of bungalow properties at the end and has a wedge shaped plot. The dwellings are faced with stone construction with tiled roofs. None have been extended to the side and they have outbuildings closely set to the neighbouring boundaries with varying degrees of set back positions. There is no clear building line with the frontages of properties being rotated and broken up by the close.

Consideration has been given here in terms of the proposals impact on the local character and street scene, including subservience, terracing and building line.

	Relevant key design principle (KDP) of the SPD, Policy in the Kirklees Local Plan and the NPPF	Further comments	✓ / X / N/A

Impact on the Local character and street scene	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • KDP1 of the SPD • Policy LP24 Design (a) and (c) of the KLP • Chapter 12 NPPF 	No clear building line to the row of properties. Would appear of unusual design but would be set back sufficiently to minimise the impact.	✓
Impact on original house	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • KDP2 of the SPD • Policy LP24 Design (c) and (d) of the KLP • Chapter 12 of the NPPF 	Would appear subservient by virtue of its width at the front of the original building with most of its bulk and massing to the rear. No set back however there is no clear building line along the frontage of the row of properties.	✓
Height, scale and massing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • KDP 1 and 2 of the SPD • Policy LP24 Design (a), (c) and (d) of the KLP • Chapter 12 of the NPPF 	Would be aligned with the host. While it would not be of subservient design, the design would provide adequate living space to the occupants within a constrained wedge shaped site.	✓
Facing materials and detailing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • KDP 9 of the SPD • Policy LP24 Design (d) (iii) of the KLP • Chapter 12 of the NPPF 	Facing and roofing materials, along with opening details to similarly match existing.	✓
Roof style	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • KDP 1 and 2 of the SPD • Policy LP24 Design (a), (c) and (d) of the KLP • Chapter 12 of the NPPF 	Pitch roof which matches the existing. No set down however, due to its bungalow design, acceptable.	✓
Window proportions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • KDP 1 and 2 of the SPD • Policy LP24 Design (a), (c) and (d) of the KLP • Chapter 12 of the NPPF 	Proportions match the existing property.	✓

Accessibility for all users	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • KDP 17 of the SPD • Policy LP24 Design (f) • Chapter 12 of the NPPF 	Private domestic extension which would not change the existing access into / around the property.	✓
-----------------------------	---	---	---

The design of the proposal is therefore acceptable and accords with policies LP24 of the adopted Kirklees Local Plan, the SPD and the NPPF.

Residential Amenity: Are the considerations in the following table acceptable?

The main properties affected are:

- *No. 47 Longden Avenue (east) – this property has a detached outbuilding with pitched roof which would be adjacent to the proposed at lower ground with a shared existing boundary fence coming up to the eaves of the outbuilding. This roof and fence would aid in visually screening the bulk and massing of the proposal for the neighbour. There would be no windows facing this property.*
- *No. 50 Longden Avenue (northwest) – the proposed extension would have its mass and bulk screened by the host with a porch extension that would face towards the carriageway with no side elevation windows.*
- *No. 6 and 8 Balmoral Avenue (rear) – the side extension would be a minimum ~37m to the rear elevation of those properties positioned to only have oblique angles from the rear elevation of the side extension.*

The porch would be of adequate distance to the opposite neighbours facing the highway so as to avoid any impacts.

	Relevant key design principle (KDP) of the SPD, Policy in the Kirklees Local Plan and the NPPF	Further comments	✓ / X / N/A
Impact on privacy of neighbours (to sides, rear and front)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • KDP 3 & 4 of the SPD • Policy LP24 Design (d) (iv) • Chapter 12 of the NPPF 	Acceptable for the reasons set out above.	✓
Impact on light and outlook of neighbours (to sides, rear and front)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • KDP 4, 5, 6 of the SPD • Policy LP24 Design (b) • Chapter 12 of the NPPF 	As above.	✓

Remaining garden space of application property	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • KDP 7 of the SPD • Policy LP24 Design (b) and (c) • Chapter 12 of the NPPF 	Rear garden would remain largely unaffected by the proposed side extension as it would be to the side of the host with a proportionate garden space left.	✓
--	--	---	---

The proposal is therefore acceptable in terms of residential amenity and accords with policy LP24 of the adopted Kirklees Local Plan, the SPD and the NPPF.

Highways and Parking: Are the following acceptable?

	Relevant key design principle (KDP) of the SPD, Policy in the Kirklees Local Plan and the NPPF	Further comments	✓ / X / N/A
Impact on highway safety	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • KDP 15 of the SPD • Policy LP22 Parking (f) of the KLP • Chapter 12 of the NPPF 	This would not intensify the use increasing the demand for on street parking. There is ample space for parking to the front of the site.	✓
Parking provision	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • KDP 15 of the SPD • Policy LP22 Parking (f) of the KLP • Chapter 12 of the NPPF 	As above.	✓
Provision for waste storage	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • KDP 16 of the SPD • Policy LP24 Design (d) (iv) • Chapter 12 of the NPPF 	None shown on plans however, there is sufficient space within the red line boundary to allow for storage on site. Condition not considered necessary.	✓

The proposal is therefore acceptable in terms of highways and parking and accords with policies LP21 and LP22 of the adopted Kirklees Local Plan, the SPD and the NPPF.

Other matters: Are the following acceptable?

	Relevant key design principle (KDP) of the SPD, Policy in the Kirklees Local Plan and the NPPF	Further comments	✓ / X / N/A
Impact on trees	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • KDP 13 of the SPD • Policy LP24 Design (d) (i) (iv) Policy LP33 Trees • Chapter 12 of the NPPF 	N/A	N/A
Impact on ecology	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • KDP 12 of the SPD • Policy LP30 • Chapter 15 of the NPPF 	Bat Alert layer - The building is in good order, well-sealed and unlikely to have any significant bat roost potential. A cautionary note is recommended.	✓
Carbon Budget / Climate change statement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • KDP 8, 9, 10 & 11 of the SPD • Policy LP51 • Chapter 14 of the NPPF 	Small scale domestic development to an existing dwelling. As such, no special measures required in terms of the planning application with regards to carbon emissions. However, there are controls in terms of Building Regulations which will need to be adhered to as part of the construction process which will require compliance with national standards. A Climate Change Statement had been supplied stating smart meters/low energy lightbulbs will be installed, the existing stone from the gable end will be reused and rainwater would be collected for garden use.	✓
Drainage and Flood Risk	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • KDP 14 of the SPD 	The rear garden's soft landscaping would be retained to allow for run-	✓

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy LP24 (d) (vii), LP27 and LP34 of the KLP 	off. The site is not located within an identified Flood Risk Zone 2 or 3 area.	
--	---	--	--

The proposal is therefore acceptable in terms of the above listed other matters and accords with policies set out in the Kirklees Local Plan, the SPD and the NPPF.

Representations, including Parish/Town Council comments:

Summary of Representation	Officer response	Addressed ✓ / X / N/A
		N/A

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 development would constitute sustainable development and is therefore recommended for approval.

Recommendation: **CONDITIONAL FULL PERMISSION**

Decision Authorisation - Delegated Powers

Application Number: 2023/90383

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 to accord with Policies LP01, LP02, LP21, LP22 & LP24 of the Kirklees Local Plan, Key Design Principles 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11 & 15 of the

Council's adopted House Extensions & Alterations Supplementary Planning Document and Policies within Chapters 2, 12, 14 and 15 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.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity and in accordance with Policies LP01, LP02 & LP24 of the Kirklees Local Plan, Key Design Principles 1 and 2 of the Council's adopted House Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document and policies within Chapter 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

NOTE: Should any bats are found during the development, then work must cease immediately, and the advice of a licensed bat worker sought.

Plans and specifications schedule:-

Plan Type	Reference	Version	Date Received
Location Plan	No. TQRQM23036082142910.	Unamended	09/02/2023
Proposed Block Plan.	No. TQRQM23036082419346.	Unamended	09/02/2023
Existing Elevation Plans (front, rear and side).		Unamended	09/02/2023
Existing Floor Plan.		Unamended	09/02/2023
Proposed Elevation Plans (front, side and rear).		Unamended	09/02/2023
Proposed Floor Plan		Unamended	09/02/2023
Proposed Roof Plan.		Unamended	09/02/2023
Climate Change Statement		Original	14/02/2023

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. There were suggested amendments to the

proposal which were rebutted with justifications submitted to accept deviation from the House Extensions and Alterations SPD in this isolated case.

Report Dated:

11/04/2023