

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:	2023/62/92795/W
Site Address:	37, Upper George Street, Springwood, Huddersfield, HD1 4AW
Description:	Erection of single storey rear extension and alterations to convert existing dwelling into House of Multiple Occupation (within a Conservation Area)
Recommending Officer:	Lucy Taylor

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.

John Holmes

AUTHORISED OFFICER

Date: 14th December 2023

Officer Report

Reference: 2023/92795

Location: 37, Upper George Street, Springwood, Huddersfield, HD1 4AW

Proposal: Erection of single storey rear extension and alterations to convert existing dwelling into House of Multiple Occupation

Site Description

37 Upper George Street is a two-storey mid-terrace property, with accommodation at basement level and in the roof served by a dormer and velux windows. The external walls of the property are faced in stone, with a natural slate gable roof above. The property does not benefit from any on-site parking. Outdoor amenity space is located to the rear of the property.

The property of 37 Upper George Street shares a strong sense of similarity with other properties in the vicinity, whereby they share the same style of design and construction, terrace and faced in matching external materials.

The site is located within the Springwood Conservation Area and is located within close proximity to Listed Buildings, with the closest approximately 13 metres away (No. 31 Upper George Street).

Description of Proposal

Planning permission is sought for the erection of a single storey rear extension and alterations to convert the existing dwelling into House of Multiple Occupation.

Single Storey Rear Extension:

The single storey rear extension would have the following dimensions:

- Projection/Length – 13 metres
- Width – 5.5 metres
- Height – 3 metres

Matching materials are to be used to face to extension and fenestration detailing would consist of windows to both side elevations.

Conversion to House of Multiple Occupation:

The alterations to convert the dwelling would create the following accommodation at each level:

- Basement floor – cinema room, utility room and guest toilet

- Ground floor (including extension) – kitchen and 6 bedrooms with ensembles
- First floor – 4 bedrooms with ensembles
- Section floor – 2 bedrooms with ensembles and 1 bedroom with an off suite

History of Negotiations/Amendments Received

No amendments were sought as it wasn't considered that there would be a design solution that would provide the level of accommodation sought.

Relevant Planning History

No relevant planning history.

Representations

We are currently undertaking the legal statutory publicity requirements, as set out at Table 1 in the Kirklees Development Management Charter. As such, we have publicised this application via a site notice, neighbour notification letters and in the press.

Final publicity date expired – 8th December 2023.

In response to publicity, 6 objections were received. The concerns raised within these objections are summarised below:

- Increased traffic congestion and potential safety hazards, as well as leading to further strain on parking demand.
- Heightened noise levels.

Consultation Responses

The Coal Authority (formal) – The Coal Authority's Planning & Development Team considers that the content and conclusions of the Coal Mining Risk Assessment report are sufficient for the purposes of the planning system and meet the requirements of the NPPF in demonstrating that the application site is safe and stable for the proposed development. Therefore, raise no objection to the proposed development.

Should planning permission be granted for this proposal, The Coal Authority's Planning & Development Team request informative notes regarding ground investigations and groundworks and shallow coal seams be included on the decision notice.

The Coal Authority's Planning & Development Team also refer to the possible requirement for further and more detailed considerations of ground conditions and foundation design as part of any subsequent building regulations application.

KC Environmental Health (formal) – Raise no objection to the proposal, with the inclusion of conditions and informatives regarding contamination and construction site working times.

KC Highways Development Management (informal) – No objection due to the sustainable location of the building and the provision of cycle storage.

KC Conservation and Design (informal) – Object to the proposal on the grounds of its negative and harmful impact to the Conservation Area.

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 site is located within the Springwood Conservation Area and is located within close proximity to Listed Buildings, with the closest approximately 13 metres away (No. 31 Upper George Street).

The application site is located within an area identified by the Coal Authority as being at high risk of ground movement as a result of former mining activity.

Kirklees Local Plan:

- LP1 – Achieving Sustainable Development
- LP2 – Place Shaping
- LP11 – Housing Mix and Affordable Housing
- LP21 – Highway Safety
- LP22 – Parking Provision
- LP24 – Design
- LP35 – Historic Environment
- LP51 – Protection and Improvement of Local Air Quality
- LP53 – Contaminated and Unstable Land

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.

National Policies and Guidance:

National planning policy and guidance is set out in National Policy Statements, primarily the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) published 5th September 2023, 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 4 – Decision-Making
- Chapter 8 – Promoting Healthy and Safe Communities
- Chapter 11 – Making Efficient Use of Land
- Chapter 12 – Achieving Well-Designed Places
- Chapter 14 – Meeting the Challenge of Climate Change, Flooding and Coastal Change
- Chapter 15 – Conserving and Enhancing the Natural Environment
- Chapter 16 – Conserving and Enhancing the Historic Environment

Legislation:

The Town & Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).

The Town & Country Planning (Listed Buildings & Conservation Areas) Act 1990

The Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

When making a recommendation in respect of a planning application affecting a Listed Building or its setting, attention must be given to Section 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 which requires the Local Planning Authority to 'have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of a special architectural or historic interest which it possesses'.

Section 72 of the Town & Country Planning (Listed Buildings & Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires Local Planning Authorities to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of Conservation Areas. This is echoed within policy LP35 of the Kirklees Local Plan and Chapter 16 of the NPPF.

Assessment

The following matters are considered in the assessment below –

- 1) Principle of development
- 2) Impact on visual amenity and the historic environment
- 3) Impact on residential amenity

- 4) Impact on highway safety
- 5) Other matters
- 6) Representations
- 7) Conclusion

1) Principle of Development

Sustainable Development:

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 on to 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 LP1 of the Kirklees Local Plan (KLP) declares that: *“...the council will take a positive approach that reflects the presumption in favour of sustainable development contained in the NPPF.”*

Policy 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.”*

Housing Mix:

In this instance, LP11 of the Kirklees Local Plan is also relevant, as the scheme aims to convert existing dwelling into House of Multiple Occupation. The policy states that: *“all proposals for housing, including those affecting the existing housing stock, will be of high quality and design and contribute to creating mixed and balanced communities in line with the latest evidence of housing need’.”*

Chapter 11 of the NPPF states that planning decisions should promote the development of under-utilised land and buildings, but this must not be at the expense of creating developments that function well and add to the quality of the area as set out in Chapter 12.

2) Impact on Visual Amenity and the Historic Environment

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.”*

Paragraph 130 of the NPPF is of relevance, in particular the following parts:-

- *‘b) Planning policies and decisions should ensure that developments are visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and appropriate and effective landscaping’*
- *‘c) Planning policies and decisions should ensure that developments are sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting, while not preventing or discouraging appropriate innovation or change’*

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 (SPD) seek to ensure development is subservient to the host property and in keeping with the character of the locality.

Paragraph 5.6 of the House Extensions and Alterations SPD sets out 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 terrace houses or by 4 metres for detached properties
- retain a gap of at least 1 metre from a property boundary, such as a wall, fence or hedge.

In terms of design, the proposal seeks to erect a single storey rear extension, which projects 13 metres from the rear elevation of the host property. Given the size/scale of the proposed single storey rear extension, it is not

considered that it would be subservient to the original building and would result in a loss of character to the form of the existing terrace property.

The proposed extension has been calculated to present a footprint of approximately 72m², with the existing ground floor of the property having a footprint of approximately 80m². Therefore, the proposed extension would nearly double the size of the existing ground floor. In turn, these measurements emphasise that the proposed extension would result in a disproportionate addition, that would lead to undue levels of bulking and massing.

Furthermore, the development would be clearly visible and prominent from public vantage points along the highway of Back Spring Street. In turn, the proposed extension has the potential to harm the character and appearance of the dwelling in the wider streetscene, whereby the property sits in the context of a row of terrace properties, where a strong sense of similarity is established.

The existing building of 37 Upper George Street forms a cohesive appearance with neighbouring properties and, whilst rear extensions appear to have erected to other properties along the terrace row, these appear to be of a more subservient size/scale. Therefore, it is concluded that the proposed development would result in an incongruous and overly prominent dwelling that would interrupt the rhythm of development and harm the quality of development in the area.

It is therefore considered that the proposed development would be unsympathetic and incongruous to the design of the terrace property which would, in turn, harm the character and appearance of the dwelling and the character of the wider street scene, contrary to Chapter 12 of the NPPF, LP24 (a and c) of the Kirklees Local Plan and Key Design Principles 1 and 2 of the House Extensions and Alterations SPD.

Historic Environment:

The site is located within the Springwood Conservation Area and is located within close proximity to Listed Buildings, with the closest approximately 13 metres away (No. 31 Upper George Street).

Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings & Conservation Areas) Act (1990) is relevant and requires that special attention shall be paid in the exercise of planning functions to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the appearance or character of the Conservation Area.

Section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings & Conservations Areas) Act (1990) states that, for development which affects a listed building or its setting, the local planning authority shall have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.

Section 66 and 72 of the Planning (Listed Building & Conservation Areas) Act (1990) are mirrored in Policy LP35 of the Kirklees Local Plan and Chapter 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

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.”*

As part of this application, the applicant submitted a Heritage Statement, which concluded the following: *“The site is within the conservation area; there will be no material change to the contribution that the building next to the character and appearance of the area there will be no harm to significance.”*

As part of the determination of this application, an informal consultation was undertaken with KC Conservation and Design, who object to the scheme on the grounds of the negative and harmful impact which the extension poses to the heritage significance of the Conservation Area.

KC Conservation and Design concluded that the proposal is for an overtly dominant extension within the Conservation Area, which would be experienced within the context of the wider streetscene. The design of the extension is considered to be entirely incongruous (accounting for other small-scale extensions in the vicinity) and, regardless of materials, the large expanse of flat roof would be out of keeping.

The KC Conservation and Design Team concluded that the proposal would lead to less than substantial harm to the Springwood Conservation Area.

Paragraph 202 of the NPPF is clear that *‘Where development proposals lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use’*.

In the case of this application, it is considered that there are no demonstrable public benefits in granting permission for the development such that it could be considered the proposal accords with the aforementioned policies. Whilst the proposal would lead to a small scale increase in residential accommodation, this is not a demonstrable public benefit which would outweigh the less than substantial harm which is identified to occur as a result of the development.

Taking account of the submitted statement, response of the Conservation Team, the size, scale and sitting of the proposal and visual impact, it is considered that the proposal would lead to less than substantial harm, posing a negative and harmful impact to the Springwood Conservation Area.

Therefore, it is concluded that the proposal fails to comply with policies within chapter 16 of the NPPF and Policy LP35 of the Kirklees Local Plan as well as the aforementioned legislation.

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.

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.

Impact on Surrounding/Neighbouring Occupants:

Key Design Principle 5 of the House Extensions and Alterations SPD refers to the 45 degrees guidelines, setting out that the line will indicate the levels of light that may be lost to the neighbouring property.

The proposed single storey rear extension would cut a line of 45-degrees across the entire rear elevation of neighbouring No. 39 Upper George Street and therefore, the extension is concluded to result in undue impacts of overbearing and overshadowing for the occupiers of this neighbouring property.

The proposed single storey rear extension would also cut a line of 45-degrees across the entire rear elevation of neighbouring No. 35 Upper George Street. Therefore, the extension is also concluded to result in undue impacts of overbearing and overshadowing for the occupiers of this neighbouring property.

With regard to privacy, the extension proposes windows in the western facing elevation of the extension, to serve bedrooms. The introduction of these bedroom windows at ground floor level would result in overlooking at close quarters, posing detriment for the occupiers of No. 39 Upper George Street as a consequence of a loss of privacy to their rear garden amenity space.

The strip windows proposed in the eastern facing side elevation of the extension would not serve a habitable room and therefore, are not considered to result in undue impacts upon the residential privacy of No. 35 Upper George Street.

With regard to impacts of noise, upon formal consultation with KC Environmental Health, it was concluded that, given the retained use of unit as residential, no further noise concerns would likely be raised as a result of development.

In light of the above, the proposal is considered to have an unacceptable impact on residential amenity, with the potential to detriment the living conditions associated with No. 35 and 39 Upper George Street. The scheme therefore fails to comply with policy LP24(b) of the Kirklees Local Plan, Key Design Principles 3, 4, 5 and 6 of the House Extensions and Alterations SPD and Chapter 12 of the NPPF.

Impact on Future Occupants:

The floorplans as proposed have been calculated to provide a gross internal floorspace of approximately 310.8sqm. The Nationally Described Space Standards contain no specific standard for HMOs, nor for houses in excess of 6 bedrooms. However, Kirklees Council has its own amenity standards for Houses of multiple occupation, which can be found at the following link: <https://www.kirklees.gov.uk/beta/housing/pdf/HMO-amenity-standards.pdf>

Whilst it should be noted that this is not an adopted planning document and therefore carries limited weight in the determination of this application, it does provide a useful guide as to the standard of amenity that is considered acceptable for a HMO.

Section 8.1 of this document refers to one unit of accommodation with cooking, living and sleeping facilities.

With regard to the size of bedrooms, this document sets out that one room for one person should have a minimum internal area of 13m² and one room for two persons should have a minimum internal area of 18.6m².

The floorplans submitted show each bedroom to have a double bed, denoting that each bedroom could serve two occupiers. Officers have calculated that some of the bedrooms within the interior of the building would have an internal area of less than 18.6m², for example, bedroom 2 to the ground floor would have an internal area of approximately 14.5m². In addition, one of the bedrooms to the second floor raises concern regarding its floor to ceiling height.

Furthermore, two of the bedrooms to the second floor would only be served by velux windows. This raises concern, with the occupants of these bedrooms likely to suffer from poor levels of amenity. This would be contrary to Policy LP24 (b) of the Kirklees Local Plan and Chapter 12 of the NPPF.

The document goes on to assess shared accommodation and states each living room should have a minimum living room size of 8m² plus an additional 1m² per person. Which would mean this HMO would require a living room size

of at least 19m². In this case, the plans show approximately 20m² of living space in the form of a cinema room to the basement.

However, the cinema room is to be located within the basement, giving the impression that occupants could spend a large majority of their time underground. The cinema room would only be served by two lightwells of a limited size/scale.

In terms of the provision of outdoor amenity space, following the erection of the single storey rear extension, a very limited extent of outdoor space would be left, which given its width to the boundary of only approximately 1 metre and its layout would not be adequately useable for future occupiers.

Whilst the property is relatively constrained by what it can offer, Officers cannot support a dwellinghouse with such an intensified bedroom usage, with such a poor standard of residential amenity regarding the size of the bedrooms, the limited outlook from bedrooms to the second floor served by roof lights only and the concerns of outlook and daylight to the shared habitable cinema room within the cellar. In addition, the proposal would fail to offer adequate outdoor amenity space to relieve the poor standards of amenity.

For the reasons outlined above, the proposal is considered contrary to LP24b of the Kirklees Local Plan and Chapter 12 of the NPPF.

4) Impact on Highway Safety

Turning to highway safety, Policies LP21 and 22 of the Local Plan, and the Highways Design Guide SPD have been considered.

As part of the determination of this application, an informal consultation was undertaken with KC Highways Development Management. KC Highways Development Management raised no objection to the proposed scheme at 37 Upper George Street due to the sustainable location within which the building is situated and the provision of cycle storage as part of the scheme.

KC Highways Development Management concluded that, given the type of dwelling proposed and its location at the edge of the town centre (close to bus station and train station), wouldn't insist on any off-street parking provisions at part of the scheme. KC Highways Development Management also made reference to the public car parks located close by for use by visitors.

KC Highways Development Management did also note that, future occupiers of the dwelling would be unlikely to be able to attain parking permits due to the building been classed as a new development.

Given its proximity to services, Officers consider this to be sustainable location whereby future occupiers may be able to avoid car use and be compliant with LP21 and LP22 of the Kirklees Local Plan and the Highways Design Guide SPD.

5) Other Matters

Climate Change:

On the 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.

As part of this application, a Climate Change Statement was submitted which set out various mitigation measures. Due to the nature of the proposal, it is considered that the proposed development would not have an impact on climate change that needs any further mitigation to address the climate change emergency. The proposed development would therefore comply with Chapter 14 of the NPPF and Policy LP51 of the Kirklees Local Plan.

High Coal:

The site is situated within a High Coal Area on the Council's internal database.

As part of this application, a Coal Report, Coal Map and Coal Mining Risk Assessment were submitted, and a formal consultation was undertaken with The Coal Authority and Environmental Health.

The Coal Authority raised no objection to the proposal, however, they did recommend that, should planning permission be granted for this proposal, informative notes regarding ground investigations and groundworks and shallow coal seams should be included on the decision notice.

KC Environmental Health also raised no objection to the proposal, subject to the inclusion of a condition and informative regarding contaminated land upon any grant of approval.

With the inclusion of the aforementioned conditions and informatives, the proposal would be considered to comply with Policy LP53 of the Kirklees Local Plan and Chapter 15 of the NPPF.

6) Representations

In response to publicity, 6 objections were received. The objections are summarised below, accompanied by an officer response:

- Increased traffic congestion and potential safety hazards, as well as leading to further strain on parking demand.

Officer Response: Noted. The impacts of the proposal upon Highway Safety have been assessed in full within section 4 of this report. Upon informal consultation with KC Highways Development Management, it was concluded that the proposal would be acceptable in this regard due to it's setting in a sustainable location and the provision of cycle storage.

- Heightened noise levels.

Officer Response: Noted. As part of the assessment of this application, KC Environmental Health were formally consulted. KC Environmental Health concluded that the proposal would not result in detrimental impacts regarding noise given that the current property is described as rented residential accommodation and its new use is to remain the same.

It should be noted that, any noise from one domestic dwelling to another would be dealt with under statutory nuisance legislation.

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 development proposals do not accord with the development plan and/or the adverse impacts of granting permission would significantly and demonstrably outweigh any benefits of the development when assessed against policies in the NPPF and other material consideration.

Recommendation: Refuse

Decision Authorisation: Delegated Powers

Application Number: 2023/92795

Officer Recommendation: Refuse

Reasons for Refusal:

1. The proposed extension by reason of its design, scale and massing would fail to be subservient to the original dwelling and would appear an incongruous addition to the host dwelling, which would, in turn, harm the character and appearance of the dwelling and the character of the wider streetscene. The proposal would therefore be contrary to Policy LP24 (a) and (c) of the Kirklees Local Plan, Key Design Principles 1 and 2 of the Kirklees House Extensions and Alterations

Supplementary Planning Document and national Policy set out in Chapter 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

2. Given the size, scale, design and prominent sitting of the proposed extension, the development would have an unacceptable impact upon the heritage significance of the Springwood Conservation Area. No public benefits are considered to exist to outweigh the less than substantial harm. The development would be contrary to Policy LP35 of the Kirklees Local Plan and Policies within Chapter 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework as well as the requirements of The Town & Country Planning (Listed Buildings & Conservation Areas) Act 1990
3. The proposed extension, by virtue of its scale, design and siting in relation to shared boundaries, would lead to a detrimental overshadowing and overbearing impact to the occupiers of No.'s 35 and 39 Upper George Street. Furthermore, the west facing windows to the bedrooms would overlook the private amenity space of No. 39 Upper George Street at close quarters. Therefore, the proposal would fail to retain a high standard of amenity for existing occupiers of these neighbouring dwellings contrary to Policy LP24(b) of the Kirklees Local Plan, Design Principles 3, 4, 5 and 6 of the Kirklees House Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document and policies within Chapter 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework.
4. The proposed development would present poor standards of amenity for future occupiers, by reason of the size of the bedrooms, the limited outlook from bedrooms to the second floor served by roof lights, outlook and daylight provision to the shared habitable cinema room within the cellar and level of outdoor amenity space which would be provided. Therefore, the development would be contrary to paragraph 130(f) of the National Planning Policy Framework, principles 3, 4, 5, 6 & 7 of the Council's adopted House Extensions and Alterations SPD and policy LP24(b) of the Kirklees Local Plan.

Plans and Specifications Schedule:

Plan Type	Reference	Version	Date Received
Location Plan	-	-	20.09.23
Proposed HMO Layout (East Section)	-	-	20.09.23
Proposed HMO Layout (Front & Back Elevations)	-	-	20.09.23
Proposed HMO Layout (Floor Plans)	-	-	20.09.23
Proposed HMO Layout (Structural Layout)	-	-	20.09.23
Proposed HMO Layout (West Section)	-	-	20.09.23
Proposed HMO Layout	-	-	20.09.23

(Existing & Proposed Site Plan)			
Proposed HMO Layout (Existing Front and Back Elevations)	-	-	20.09.23
Proposed HMO Layout (East & West Section)	-	-	20.09.23
Existing Layout	-	-	20.09.23
Proposed Site Plan	-	-	23.10.23
Design and Access Statement	-	-	20.09.23
Climate Change Statement	-	-	23.10.23
Coal Report	51003384758001	-	23.10.23
Coal Map	-	-	23.10.23
Coal Mining Risk Assessment	-	-	25.10.23

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.

No amendments were sought as it wasn't considered that there would be a design solution that would provide the level of accommodation sought.

Report Dated:

12.12.23