

PLANNING STATEMENT  
APPLICATION FOR PLANNING PERMISSION  
for  
ERECTION OF GROUND FLOOR REAR EXTENSION  
at  
14 Malvern Rise, Primrose Hill.  
Huddersfield HD4 6D9

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 The application seeks full planning permission for a single storey extension at the rear of the property.

1.2 The proposal has been amended with a view to overcoming the concerns of the Council which saw fit to refuse an earlier application.

1.3 The application comprises: -

- Application form and certificate
- This Planning Statement
- Location plan
- Valley Properties Drawing 2023/041/04 Rev B
- Climate change statement

2.0 APPLICATION HISTORY.

2.1 On 24 March 2023 the Council refused an application for the erection of ground floor and basement extensions (application 2023/90247)

2.2 On 17 August 2023 an application for a ground floor extension was withdrawn (application 2023/91371)

2.3 The first application, 2023/90247 was refused for 2 reasons: -  
Harming the character and appearance of the dwelling and the wider street scene; and, secondly, adversely affecting the amenity of adjoining residents at No's 12 and 16 Malvern Rise

2.4 Briefly, the proposal comprised a 2-storey extension at the rear of 14 Malvern Rise, an inner terrace residential property. Essentially comprising a kitchen and toilet extension extending from the existing ground floor, the proposals included an internal staircase link to a basement study, utility room and shower room.

2.5 Extending outwards by 6 metres the extension was shown with a shallow pitched roof set in from the boundary with both No's 12 and 16

### 3.0 THE APPLICATION CONTEXT

3.1 The plans now submitted in respect of the current proposal correctly show the relationship of the application property to its immediate neighbours No's 12 and 16.

3.2 No.12 Malvern Rise has its internal floor level consistent with that of No. 14. Steps down from the respective back doors lead to a rear footway adjoined by a small single storey building comprising two parts, providing separate storage facilities for No's 12 and 14.

3.3 A rather strident uPVC conservatory projects from the rear elevation of No. 12.

3.4 So far as No. 16 Malvern Rise is concerned its ground floor steps up from that of No. 14 by some 350mm, as does its raised decking in relation to the raised terrace at No. 14.

### 4.0 THE APPLICATION PROPOSALS.

4.1 An extension, but only to the ground floor, is proposed which will project 4.5 metres from the rear wall of the host building. No basement is proposed.

4.2 To reduce its impacts on the host building and the street scene, the proposed internal floor level steps down rather than being at existing level as in the previous, refused application. This has the benefit of reducing the extension's overall height whilst showing a traditional blue slate roof to match the main house roof which would not have been possible under the previous proposal.

4.3 A hipped end to the ridged roof will reduce its impact as seen from the rear.

4.4 As previously, the extension will be set in from the common boundaries to both 12 and 16 Malvern Rise. The plans in particular showing the true relationship in terms of distance and height from the kitchen window at No. 16. The plan also indicates the 45-degree overshadowing guideline set out at figure 14 in the Council's House Extensions and Alterations SPD

## 5.0 ASSESSMENT

5.1 2 No. reasons were given refusal of the earliest application (2023/90247). I deal with each in turn.

### 5.2 Harm to the appearance of the dwelling and wider street scene.

The extension is to the rear of the property, and will not be visible from any public highway. It will only be visible to nearby residents from their own properties or if using the rear access track.

That track gives access to rear gardens and various garages such as that of the application property. Furthermore, from the track, various extensions to nearby properties are visible. These include the sun lounge extensions at Nos. 10 and 12 Malvern Rise and the 2-storey extension at No. 24. The latter two are particularly striking because of, in respect of No. 12, its white panelling and framework strongly contrasting with the stone and render of the original home; and in respect of the extension at No. 24, its largely cream-coloured render which strongly contrasts with the much darker render of nearby properties.

5.3 In contrast, the extension as now proposed will not be incongruous and discordant which formed part of the reason why the previous application was refused. Natural stonework, matching colour render and matching blue slate roof will mean that the extension will appear as a modest, appropriately designed extension to the host building.

In terms of the impact on the wider street scene (The rear access track) the extension will in fact be seen as appropriately designed in marked contrast to others nearby. Furthermore, in the context of the clutter of garages and domestic paraphernalia as seen from the access track, I doubt that the proposed extension will even be noticed by anyone passing by.

### 5.4 Overshadowing and Overlooking Impact on the occupiers of Nos. 12 and 16 Malvern Rise.

5.5 So far as the impact of the extension on the occupiers of No. 12 is concerned, the only potential impact is from the windows in the side of the sunlounge. The view of the proposed extension from those windows (usually obscured by blinds) will be partly obscured by the storage outbuilding for No. 12 which will remain when the building's other half, that for No. 14, is demolished as part of the overall proposal. No windows are proposed in the side elevation facing No. 12.

5.6 So far as the impact of the extension on the occupiers of No. 16 is concerned, as seen from the kitchen window at No. 16 its bulk is shown by the horizontal eyeline shown in the north-western elevation and the 45-degree angle on both the proposed ground floor plan and the roof plan.

It is evident that the ridge of the extension will barely be higher than the eyeline and outlook at a 45-degree angle will barely be interrupted.

Being situated to the north-east of No. 16 there will be no loss of early morning sunlight to the kitchen of No. 16, nor to the outside decking.

5.7 It should be noted that, at the time of writing, no public objection has been raised, unlike with the previous withdrawn application.

## 5.8 POLICY

Reference is made in the refusal notice re the earlier application to both the Kirklees Local Plan and the House Extensions and Alterations SPD. Dealing firstly with the Local Plan, particular reference is made to Policy LP 24 paragraphs a, b and c. With reference to the matters identified it is now considered that the form, scale, layout and details of the new proposal respect the character of the townscape, it provides a high standard of amenity for future and neighbouring occupiers and is subservient to and in keeping with the original building.

5.9 Dealing now with the House Extensions SPD it must be emphasised that it provides guidance rather than setting out templates that must be adhered to. Sections 5.1 to 5.6 deals with rear extensions. Having regard to matters raised, a back garden of reasonable size will be retained, and external access to it will be maintained. (5.1)

The extension will respect the original house and garden in terms of size and scale and use matching materials. It will not have an unduly adverse impact by way of overshadowing a loss of outlook of neighbouring properties for the reasons set out above. (5.2 and 5.3)

As a starting point at Section 4.17 of the SPD the 45-degree angle from a neighbouring window is set out as a guideline. Though the proposal marginally fails to meet that guideline in respect of the impact on No. 16, it is considered that the lower height of the extension compared with the internal floor level at No. 16 is such that undue impact because of loss of light and outlook is avoided. (5.4)

Though the extension will exceed 4 metres in height at its outer edge; its immediate impact as seen by neighbours from their houses will be less than 4 metres. Though the projection is 4.5 metres rather than 3 metres, the impact on residents on either side is considered acceptable as the effective eaves height will not exceed 2.5 metres.

Finally, a gap in excess of 1 metre to the side boundary with No. 12 will be retained. That is not achieved in respect of No. 16 but is nevertheless considered acceptable given the reduced height re respective floor levels.

5.10 It is considered that the changes made to the proposal from that previously refused:

- a reduction in projection from 6 metres to 4.5 metres
- a roofline 450mm lower

- increased distance from the boundary with No. 16 Malvern Rise
- a hipped rather than a gable end

are such that the reasons for refusal of the earlier application are no longer valid. Furthermore, on the basis that the proposal raises no new issues, it is considered that it is appropriate to grant planning permission.

Malcolm Sizer

Malcolm Sizer Planning Ltd.

January 2024