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:	**2024/62/90951/W**
Site Address:	22, Goldcrest Court, Netherton, Huddersfield, HD4 7LN
Description:	Erection of single and two storey extension
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: 17-Jun-2024

Officer Report.

Reference: 2024/90951

Location: 22, Goldcrest Court, Netherton, Huddersfield, HD4 7LN

Proposal: Erection of single and two storey extension

Site Description.

22 Goldcrest Court is a two-storey detached property located in Netherton, Huddersfield. The property is faced in reconstituted stone and the gable roof above is infilled with concrete tiles. A garage is located to the front elevation of the property. Private outdoor amenity space is located to the rear of the dwelling.

The site is located within a residential cul-de-sac where sense of similarity is established, with the properties located in Goldcrest Court sharing a very similar style of design and construction and faced in matching exterior materials.

Description of Proposal.

Planning permission is sought for the erection of single and two storey extension.

The two-storey side extension is proposed to the southern side elevation of the host property. This two-storey side extension would have the following dimensions:

- Projection – 2.3 metres
- Length – 10 metres
- Maximum height – 6 metres (extension ridge set down 0.2 metres from ridge height)

The proposed two-storey front extension would have the following dimensions:

- Projection – 1.1 metres

- Width – 2.10 metres
- Maximum height – 5.5 metres

The proposed single storey side extension to the northern side elevation would have the following dimensions:

- Projection – 2 metres
- Length – 11.6 metres
- Maximum height – 3.3 metres

The external walls of the extension would be faced in reconstituted yellow stone to match the existing property and the roofs would be infilled with concrete roof tiles.

A supporting statement has been submitted as part of the application, which sets out the following summarised points:

- The house is considered to be an outdated interior design
- The proposal is sought to allow the dwelling to be utilised to meet the requirements of the applicants' growing family and the development is intended to enhance the home.
- The single-story extension, hidden by the neighbouring 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 proposal is considered to meet the requirements of the SPD and would not lead to significant levels of overlooking.
- 3 additional off-road car parking spaces in addition to the existing garage are proposed.

An updated block plan which indicates a dedicated parking area has been submitted as part of this application which differs from that of the previous submission which did not demonstrate an off street parking provision.

<u>History of Negotiations / Amendments Received.</u>

The case officer did not enter into negotiations with the applicant or planning agent and no amended plans were sought or submitted.

The reason for this was because it was not considered that amendments could be sought within the remit of the description of proposal, that would provide the level of accommodation sought.

In addition, officers are aware of the previous determination of planning application 2023/93348, with a recommendation for refusal, determined 15th January 2024.

Therefore, the overall determination of this application is on the basis of the submitted plans and information, 4th April 2024.

Relevant Planning History.

At the application site:

- 2023/93348 – Erection of single storey and two storey extension to dwelling and single storey extension to outbuilding. *Refused for the following reasons:*

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.

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.

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.

Whether these reasons have been overcome, having regard to the submitted statement and detail / plans submitted as part of this application is addressed within the 'Assessment' section of this application.

To neighbouring properties the following planning history is noted:

- 2003/91997 – 18 Goldcrest Court – Erection of first floor extension. *Granted Conditional Full Permission.*

- 2005/93952 – 16 Goldcrest Court – Erection of single storey extension. *Granted Conditional Full Permission.*

- 2006/91616 – 16 Goldcrest Court – Erection of single storey extension (modified proposal). *Granted Conditional Full Permission.*

- 94/90287 – 16 Goldcrest Court – Erection of first floor extension and conservatory. *Granted Conditional Full Permission.*

Representations.

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

Final publicity date expired 30 May 2024.

In response to publicity, no representations were received.

Consultation Responses.

No consultations were undertaken for this application.

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 for Kirklees is the Local Plan (adopted 27th February 2019).

The application site is located within the Holme Valley Corridor Strategic Green Infrastructure Network.

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

Kirklees Local Plan:

- LP1 – Achieving Sustainable Development
- LP2 – Place Shaping
- LP21 – Highway Safety
- LP22 – Parking Provision
- LP24 – Design
- LP31 – Strategic Green Infrastructure Network
- LP51 – Protection and Improvement of Local Air Quality

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 20th December 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 12 – Achieving Sustainable and Beautiful Places
- Chapter 14 – Meeting the Challenge of Climate Change, Flooding and Coastal Change
- Chapter 15 – Conserving and Enhancing the Natural Environment

Assessment.

The following matters will be considered as part of the assessment of the proposal. These considerations will be looked at in detail individually:

1) Principle of development
2) Impact on visual amenity
3) Impact on residential amenity
4) Impact on highway safety
5) Other matters
6) Conclusion

1) Principle of 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 onto 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".*

The conclusion section of this report sets out the conclusions in relation to the principle of the development in light of all other material considerations.

2) Impact on Visual Amenity

The NPPF offers guidance relating to design in chapter 12 (achieving well designed places) whereby paragraph 131 provides a principal consideration concerning design which states: *"The creation of high-quality, beautiful and sustainable 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 135 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.

Section 5.2 of the House Extensions and Alterations SPD relates to front extensions.

Paragraph 5.13 of the House Extensions and Alterations SPD sets out the following with regard to front extensions: *"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."*

Paragraph 5.14 sets out that front extensions 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.

Firstly, the proposed extensions to the front would see a two-storey gable element added. Therefore, given the size, scale and height of this addition to the front elevation, it is not considered that it would appear as small or subservient in design to the original building. This front addition would project forward of the principal elevation of the host dwelling by 1.1 metres and is not considered to be sufficiently set down, with the ridge height of the front extension to meet the eaves height of the host roof.

Given the siting of the dwellinghouse within the streetscene, the proposed front extension would be clearly visible from serval public vantage points within the streetscene, whereby the house is located within a prominent position within the cul-de-sac.

Section 5.3 of the House Extensions and Alterations SPD relates to side extensions.

Paragraph 5.17 refers to single storey side extensions and states that they should:

- not extend more than two thirds of the width of the original house;
- not exceed a height of 4 metres; and
- be set back at least 500mm from the original building line to allow for a visual break.

Paragraphs 5.19 and 5.20 provide specific guidance regarding the recommended design of two-storey side extensions. Paragraph 5.20 sets out that two-storey side extensions should:

- not take up all or most of the space to the side of a house;
- maintain a 1 metre gap to the side boundary to ensure the building is not too close to a neighbouring property; and
- be set back at least 500mm from the front wall of the house.

The design of the proposed single storey side extension is contrary to the recommendations as set out within the House Extensions and Alterations SPD. Whilst the width of the proposed single storey side extension would not exceed two thirds of the width of the original house or the height exceed 4 metres, the extension would project forward of the principal elevation of the host dwelling by 1.1 metres.

The design of the proposed two-storey side extension to 22 Goldcrest Court is contrary to the design principles of the House Extensions and Alterations SPD as set out above. The two-storey side extension would not appear as a subservient addition to the host property, presenting an undue extent of additional bulk/massing to the front and side of the dwellinghouse.

The submitted drawings shown on plan no. 011-PL-02 shows the minimal extent of separation that would be retained from shared boundaries to both side elevations of the site as a result of the proposed single and two-storey side extensions. The floor plans show that, towards the rear of the two-storey side extension, the closest elevation would abut the shared boundary and the single storey side extension would retain a separation distance of less than one metre.

Cumulatively, these design factors would result in the extensions appearing cramped within the site and overtly oppressive within the streetscene.

Whilst officers note the two-storey front projections to No’s 16 and 18 Goldcrest Court and the single storey side extension to No. 16 Goldcrest Court, these are not considered to afford significant weight in the determination of this current planning application. The reason for this is because the extensions to these neighbouring properties were granted permission prior to the adopted of the House Extensions and Alterations SPD. In addition, the individual context against which they are viewed would not be directly comparable in this case, with the host property the subject of this application being a detached dwelling which is in a prominent part of the street with greater distances surrounding the site in relation to other built form.

It is therefore concluded that the proposed development would not comply with the policies within Chapter 12 of the NPPF, Policies LP1, LP2 or LP24 of the Kirklees Local Plan and Key Design Principles 1 and 2 of the House Extensions and Alterations SPD.

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 135 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.

The proposal would see a reduction in the extent of rear garden amenity space at 22 Goldcrest Court, but it is considered that an adequate amount would be retained in accordance with Key Design Principle 7 of the House Extensions and Alterations SPD.

It is considered that the properties most likely to be affected by the proposed development would be those which directly neighbour the site, these are assessed in turn below:

No.'s 12, 14, 16, 18 & 20 Osprey Drive:

These properties neighbour the application site to the north.

Given the proposed location of the two-storey side extension to the host dwelling it is not considered that this addition would result in any undue impacts of overbearing, overshadowing or overlooking for the occupiers of these neighbouring properties.

The proposed two-storey front extension and single storey side extension are not considered to result in undue impacts of overbearing or overshadowing for the occupiers of adjacent properties. This is predominantly because the extension to the side elevation is to be single storey in height and the two-storey front extension is of a scale which is not considered to be of such size that it would significantly impact and retains a separation distance from the shared boundary with adjacent properties (approximately 2.5 metres). In addition, the single storey side extension and two-storey front extension are considered acceptable with regards to retaining appropriate levels of residential privacy, with no glazing proposed to the side elevations facing towards the adjacent neighbouring properties. Whilst velux windows are proposed, given the nature, sitting and outlook of such glazing, it is not considered that the roof lighting would result in undue levels of overlooking.

It is considered that the proposed works would be a sufficient distance away from No.'s 12 and 14 to prevent any undue impacts to residential amenity.

No.'s 24 and 26 Goldcrest Court:

Given the proposed locations of the two-storey front and single storey side extension to the host dwelling, it is not considered that these additions would result in any undue impacts of overbearing, overshadowing or overlooking for the occupiers of these neighbouring properties.

The proposed two-storey side extension would introduce a solid blank elevation which abuts the shared boundary with No. 24 to the rear and the majority of the built form that makes up this side extension would be separated from this shared boundary by less than one metre. As a result of this, it is considered that the proposed two-storey side extension introduces an undue extent of overbearing upon the occupiers of this neighbouring property and would be unduly oppressive.

Desktop sunlight calculator software has been used to make an assessment of the impacts of overshadowing upon No. 24 Goldcrest Court as a result of the proposed two-storey side extension. This software helped to conclude that there would be no undue impacts of overshadowing to the property of No. 24 Goldcrest Court in the winter as a result of the two-storey side extension and that overshadowing would be limited to after 20:00 in the summer as a result of erecting this extension.

It is considered that the proposed works would be a sufficient distance away from No. 26 Goldcrest Court to prevent any undue impact to residential amenity.

For the reasons set out in this section of the report, the proposed development to 22 Goldcrest Court is considered to cause undue harm to the residential amenities of neighbouring properties, specifically the overbearing and oppressive impacts that would occur for the occupiers of No. 24 Goldcrest Court.

The scheme therefore fails to comply with policy LP24(b) of the Kirklees Local Plan, Key Design Principle 6 of the House Extensions and Alterations SPD and policies within Chapter 12 of the NPPF.

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.

The proposed extensions would take the number of bedrooms within the interior of the dwelling from three to four. The two-storey side extension would

see the removal of the existing area of hardstanding to the side of the property.

Paragraph 4.42 of the House Extensions and Alterations SPD sets out that:

'Proposals should maintain appropriate access and parking arrangements, including for bicycles. The number of parking spaces required are dependent on the size of the property and the prevailing local characteristics and will be considered on a case-by-case basis. An initial point of reference for residential development is as follows: 2 to 3 bedroom dwellings provide a minimum of 2 off-street car parking spaces, 4+ bedroom dwellings provide 3 off-street parking spaces'

Whilst the existing garage would be retained as a garage, its size is below the minimum size of a one-car garage, which should be, on average, approximately 6 metres in length and 3.65 metres in width. The length of the garage at 22 Goldcrest is 4.85 metres with a width of 2.45 metres. Therefore, the garage does not constitute an on-site parking space.

In addition, whilst the submitted Justification Statement sets out that the scheme 'now proposes 3 additional off-road car parking spaces', this is not considered to be accurate. The space for the 3 car parking spaces shown on the submitted 'proposed site plan' has a width of approximately 4 metres and length of approximately 7 metres, with standards suggesting that one car parking space is to measure, on average, 4.8m x 2.4 metres. Therefore, it is not considered that parking arrangements as drawn on the submitted 'proposed site plan' could be implemented at the site in accordance with policies relating to highway safety.

Therefore, for the reasons set out above, officers consider that, at a maximum, only two on-site parking spaces could be provided to the front of the host dwelling. The Council's Highways Design Guide SPD and House Extensions and Alterations SPD sets out that 4-bedroom dwellings should provide 3 off-street parking spaces. Therefore, the proposed extensions would be considered to result in an intensification of the residential use of the site, with the loss of on-site parking to the side elevation and compensatory parking below required standards.

Notwithstanding this however, given the provision of two-onsite parking spaces and available on street parking directly outside the property, in this instance, the proposal is considered to be acceptable with regard to highway safety.

The proposal is therefore concluded to be comply with Policies LP21 and LP22 of the Kirklees Local Plan, principle 15 of the House Extensions and Alterations SPD, Highways Design Guide SPD and policies within Chapter 9 of the NPPF.

5) Other Matters

Climate Change:

Principle 8 of the Kirklees House Extensions and Alterations SPD states that extensions and alterations should, where practicable, maximise energy efficiency. Principle 9 goes on to highlight that the use of innovative construction materials and techniques, including reclaimed and recycled materials should be used where possible. Furthermore, Principles 10 and 11 request that extensions and alterations consider the use of renewable energy and designing water retention into the proposals.

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.

As part of this application a Climate Change Statement was submitted, which set out several mitigation measures. Considering the small-scale of the proposed development, 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.

Strategic Green Infrastructure Network:

Policy LP31 of the Kirklees Local Plan identifies a number of areas which form part of the Strategic Green Infrastructure Network. This policy sets out that priority will be given to safeguarding and enhancing green infrastructure networks, green infrastructure assets and the range of functions they provide. This policy sets out that development should ensure the function and connectivity of green infrastructure is retained / replaced, new or enhances green infrastructure is provided / integrated into new developments. In addition, this policy requires integration of developments into walking / cycling network and providing new links where appropriate and the protection of biodiversity / ecological links. Where the creation of new or enhanced green infrastructure is proposed, provided it does not conflict with other policies within the Kirklees Local Plan policy LP31 sets out that the Council will support such development.

The proposal would not see the removal of any existing trees or hedgerows.

The proposal is not considered to have a significant impact upon the strategic infrastructure network and is concluded to be acceptable in this regard.

Coal Legacy:

The site is located within the Coal Authority's "Development Low Risk Area". There is no statutory requirement to consult the Coal Authority regarding development within the "Development Low Risk Area", instead an informative note can be appended to the decision notice which constitutes the deemed consultation response. The application site falls within an area at low risk of ground movement as a result of past mining activities as determined by the Coal Authority. As such it is considered that it is unnecessary in this case to require a survey of land stability to be carried out with regard to previous mining activity which may have taken place within the locality. It is recommended that the Coal Authority's standing advice is provided with any grant of approval. As such it is considered that the proposal is acceptable with regard to ground stability in accordance with paragraphs 180 and 189 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

6) 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 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 considerations.

The proposal is considered to have an unacceptable visual impact upon the host property and wider locality as a result of the size/scale and design of the extensions.

The proposal is also concluded to have an unacceptable impact upon the residential amenity of the occupiers of No. 24 Goldcrest Court. Whereby, as a result of the extensions, the occupiers of these neighbouring properties would experience an unacceptable level of overbearing and the extensions would be unduly oppressive.

The revised / additional detail submitted as part of this application is not considered to have sufficiently overcome the previous reasons for refusal. It is considered significant amendment would be required to address the reasons and therefore the LPA has moved this application to determination on the basis of the detail as submitted.

The proposal is therefore considered to be contrary to policy LP2 which seeks to ensure all development proposals build on the strengths, opportunities and help address challenges identified in the Local Plan, in order to protect and enhance the qualities which contribute to the character of these places.

Recommendation: Refuse

Decision Authorisation: Delegated Powers
Application Number: 2024/90951
Officer Recommendation: Refuse Permission

Reasons for Refusal:

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.

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.

Plans and Specifications Schedule: -

Plan Type	Reference	Version	Date Received
Site & Location Plans	011-PL-01	-	04.04.24
Existing Plans and Elevations	011-EX-01	-	04.04.24
Proposed Plans and Elevations	011-PL-02	-	04.04.24
Climate Change Statement	-	-	04.04.24
Justification Statement	-	-	04.04.24

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 preapplication advice service available, complied with the Kirklees Development Management Charter 2015 and otherwise actively engaged with the applicant in dealing with the application.

The case officer did not enter into negotiations with the applicant or planning agent and no amended plans were sought or submitted. The reason for this was because the case officer did not consider that amendments could be sought within the remit of the description of proposal, that would provide the level of accommodation sought.

Report dated:	17.06.24