Justification Statement

22 Goldcrest Court, Netherton

March 2024

To whom it may concern,

The following text describes the proposed alterations to 22 Goldcrest Court, Netherton and also raises how we have developed the scheme in response to the feedback received through the previous application (Number: 2023/62/93348). After time spent discussing the scheme and feedback received with the client, we have worked hard to meet the criteria raised and justify the design decisions by using the House Extensions and Alterations SPD (June 2021). We are now happy that the scheme has met the points raised whilst also providing a forever home for our client.

The plot itself is part of a larger development and sits at the end of a cul-de-sac. Although the building has a generous plot with ample space for 3 car parking spaces at the front and land all the way around, the house itself offers an outdated interior design layout with small living and bedroom spaces. Our client and family, who are from the area, intend to turn this house into their forever home and extend it to match the needs of their growing family and live in a contemporary modern way. The proposed alterations are designed to enhance the home by creating open living spaces that connect to the garden. Aesthetically the proposal seeks to enhance the existing architectural merit and tie in with the existing materials.

Below I would like to address the 3 key points raised in the refusal notice.

1. The proposed development by reason of its design, scale and massing would fail to be subservient to the original dwelling and would appear out of keeping to the host dwelling, having a harmful impact upon the character and appearance of the dwelling and wider street scene. The development would therefore be contrary to Policy LP24 parts (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.

And

2. By reason of its close proximity and design, the proposed two storey side extension would have an unacceptable overbearing impact, and be unduly oppressive, to the occupiers of No. 24 Goldcrest Court contrary to Policy LP24 of the Kirklees Local Plan, Key Design Principle 6 of the Council's adopted House Extensions and Alterations SPD and policies within Chapter 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Response:

We have looked at the design and, in all aspects, pulled the scale and massing back as to be subservient to the existing dwelling.

- **The single-story extension, hidden by the neighboring fence, has been pulled back 650mm from the boundary, allowing for access to be gained externally to the garden.**

- **The Double extension to the rear is now off set 300mm below the existing ridge.**

- **The side double extension is also off set 300mm below the existing ridge with a roof scape that chamfers towards the existing dwelling to soften the massing. It has also been set back 500mm from the front wall of the existing dwelling.**

- **The extensions now fit within the guidance set out in the Extensions & Alterations Supplementary Planning Document. Key design principle 2: Impact on the original house 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.**

Figure 4 (left to right): Extension faces onto the street and is well balanced, proportionate and sympathetic; Extension is unbalanced and over dominant in scale to the existing house; and Example of a good extension which is well proportioned and set back from the building line and ridge line of the existing house.

- **The proposal has been pulled back from the boundary that parties with number 24, with no overlooking issues (one opaque window) or sunlight issues.**

3. The proposed extensions would result in an intensification of the residential use of the site, resulting in further accommodation, whereby no compensatory off-street parking has been provided. The limited on-site parking would result in vehicles parking on the highway network, increasing the likelihood of conflict between highway uses. The proposal would therefore result in a detrimental impact to the safety and convenience of highway users including pedestrians. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies LP21 and LP22 of the Kirklees Local Plan, principle 15 of the Kirklees House Extensions and Alterations SPD, the guidance contained within the Kirklees Highways Design Guide SPD and policy within Chapter 9 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Response: We now propose 3 additional off-road car parking spaces in addition to the existing garage.

Going forward we would like to open a dialogue with yourselves leading to the decision date, if you have any further queries relating to the design.

Thank you for your time,

Joe Dempsey

Director, architect

Dempsey+Gannon