

**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:	2024/62/91097/W
Site Address:	47, Park Road, Crosland Moor, Huddersfield, HD4 5DB
Description:	Demolition of existing garage, erection of single storey front and rear extensions and extension to form first floor
Recommending Officer:	Tom Hunt

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.

Emma Thompson

AUTHORISED OFFICER

Date: 24-Jun-2024

Officer Report

Site Description

2024/91097 – 47, Park Road, Crosland Moor, Huddersfield, HD4 5DB

The application site relates to a one storey, detached bungalow with a single-storey rear extension and a detached outbuilding on a corner plot between Park Road and Everard Street. It is faced in cream render with red tile roof. It has landscaped front and side amenity areas with a driveway leading to its outbuilding situated at the rear south corner. There is a hard surfaced rear yard. The site is on ground that falls from southwest to northeast.

The property is situated between two-storey, traditional stone-built housing on its corner plot; it is noted that the property is set against the shared boundary with no. 45's driveway providing no property gaps to boundary. To its opposite corner plot, a similarly designed bungalow still has its natural stone façade. Otherwise, there is a mix of properties' design harmonised with use of natural stone and slate.

Description of Proposal

Demolition of existing garage, erection of single storey front and rear extensions and extension to form first floor.

All figures are approximate and in metres.

It is proposed to extend the bungalow with a first-floor extension. The overall height to ridge would be 8.3m and height to eaves 5.75m. The additional storey would be on the original footprint of the host at 9.7m width and 8.6m depth.

A single-storey rear outrigger and the existing garage would be removed

It is proposed to have a single-storey front extension with a lean-to roof. The single-storey front extension would project 2m from the front and be 9.7m width with a roof ridge height of 3.8m and eaves of 3m from ground.

The single-storey rear extension would project 3.4m from the rear elevation and be the width of the original host at 9.7m with a flat roof height of 2.6m from ground level. The roof would have two roof lanterns.

This would add one bedroom to the property to be a three bedroom property.

The host would have new windows at ground and first storey (front and rear); the northwest side elevation would have one window to ground floor and the southeast side would have no windows.

The side amenity space would have limited tarmacked to provide parking spaces for 3 vehicles. This would require a wider existing opening to the side boundary wall, 5m wide and new dropped kerb.

Plans indicates that the property will be faced with K render finish similar to existing and its Everard Street roadside elevation to retain the scattered stone finish. It would be roofed with red double roman tile and have white pvc doors/windows.

History of negotiations/amendments received.

The agent was notified of the recommendation of Refusal based on submitted plans and was provided with advised amendments to secure a more positive outcome. An Extension of Time request and/or amended plans was not supplied so Officers proceeded to determination to meet the initial target date.

Relevant Planning History

2023/92671	Raising of roof and eaves of the dwelling to create first floor and new roof with rooms within the roof space, single storey extension to front, side and rear, dormers to rear roof space, and associated external alterations and widened existing access from Everard Street . <i>Refused.</i>
------------	--

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 which expired on: 13/06/2024.

No representations received.

Consultation Responses

None.

Policy

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 unallocated on the Kirklees Local Plan. It is in a low probability area for flooding with some localised flooding mainly to highways. Park Road is a C road (C400). It is in a swift nesting area.

Kirklees Local Plan (LP):

- **LP 1 – Presumption in favour of sustainable development**
- **LP 2 – Place shaping**
- **LP 21 – Highways and access**
- **LP 22 – Parking**
- **LP 24 – Design**
- **LP 28 – Drainage**
- **LP 30 – Biodiversity & Geodiversity**
- **LP 34 – Conserving and enhancing the water environment**

Supplementary Planning Guidance and other considerations

- Highways Design Guide SPD
- House Extensions and Alterations SPD (2021)
- Waste Management Design Guide for New Developments (Oct 2020, v.5)
- Biodiversity Net Gain in Kirklees Technical Advice Note (2021)
- Kirklees Climate Change Guidance for Planning Applications (2021)
- Institute of Air Quality Management Land-Use Planning & Development Control; Planning for Air Quality (2017)
- West Yorkshire Low Emissions Strategy and Air Quality and Emissions Technical Planning Guidance (2016)

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, the Planning Practice Guidance Suite (PPGS) first launched 6th March 2014 together with Circulars, Ministerial 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 well-designed 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 are considered in the assessment below –

- 1) Principle of development
- 1) Impact on visual amenity
- 2) Impact on residential amenity
- 3) Impact on highway safety
- 4) Other matters – e.g. trees/ecology
- 5) Conclusion

1 – Principle of development:

1.1 Sustainable Development

Policy LP1 of the Local Plan states that when considering development proposals, the council will take a positive and proactive approach that reflects the presumption in favour of sustainable development contained in the NPPF.

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”*.

Key Design Principles 1 and 2 of the House Extensions and Alterations SPD have been used as a guide in considering the proposal’s visual amenity impact on the streetscene and host.

Paragraph 11 concludes that the presumption in favour of sustainable development does not apply where specific policies in the NPPF indicate development should be restricted. This too will be explored.

2 –Impact on visual amenity:

In terms of visual amenity, general design considerations are set out in Policy LP02, and LP24 of the Local Plan, Key Design Principles 1 and 2 of the House Extensions and Alterations SPD, and Chapter 12 of the NPPF, which seeks to achieve good quality, visually attractive, sustainable design to correspond with the scale of development in the local area, respecting and enhancing the character of the townscape, heritage assets and protect amenity. LP24 also requires extensions to be *“subservient to the original building, are in keeping with the existing buildings in terms of scale, materials and details”*.

Paragraph 134 of the NPPF sets out that design guides and codes carry weight in decision making. Of note, Paragraph 139 of the NPPF states that development that is not well designed should be refused, especially where it fails to reflect local design policies and government guidance on design, taking into account any local design guidance and supplementary planning documents such as design guides and codes.

Relevant to this is the Kirklees House Extensions and Alterations SPD 2021, which aims to ensure future development of extensions and alterations is of high-quality design.

The 5.7 of the House Extensions and Alterations SPD states that: *“careful consideration should be given to two storey and first floor extensions to bungalows. These can cause a negative impact on the street scene and*

character of the area through changing the heights, rhythm or form of a roof in relation to the rest of the street scene." In the absence of a street scene plan it is difficult to assess how the development would relate to neighbouring properties. It is noted that the neighbouring dwellings are two storey and as such some increase in height could be supported should it be demonstrated that the increase in proportions of the building sits comfortably within the street scene (as required at 5.32 of the SPD). The scale and form of development submitted would detract from the character of the existing street particularly when taking into account the architectural merit of the dwellings to the south east. The proposed dwelling would not appear to relate well to existing development within the street.

Guidance in the SPD advises that all extensions should typically be in matching materials, made visually smaller than the host and set back from the primary elevation to reduce prominence and to aid in the host and streetscene character being harmonised with each other. If the design requires contrasting materials, different architectural styles and roof pitches, this would be assessed on a case-by-case basis.

Officers requested streetscene elevation plans to fully assess the proposal's impacts, in the absence of those plans, Officers made their assessment as follows.

The SPD notes that *"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 of the SPD (page 27) states that they are usually unacceptable due to the impact on the character of the area and will not be permitted unless the house is well set back from the pavement or is well screened, the extension would be small and subservient to the property, be well designed and have materials matching the existing features of the original house in order to respect the original character of the host and area. The proposal would have a single-storey front extension which is limited to the original building width. This would be set back 6.5m from the footway/highway at the front and bring the property closer at a minimum of 4.3m to the side footway on a prominent corner plot and it would be set behind the building line of no. 45. Whilst it would not unduly encroach on the highway as demonstrated by being set back behind or approximately within its existing neighbouring building lines. It would appear to add a very prominent quantum of bulk and massing as demonstrated by its full width spanning the front elevation of the host and would not be considered as a small front extension to a newly two storey host. Seen as part of a pair of bungalows with no. 55, this would create a visually unbalanced pair with the additional front extension and the first floor extension and would erode the present sense of spaciousness and openness within the streetscene.

Considering the streetscene, the locality either have their front elevations with bay window extensions protruding ~1m from the primary elevation or without. In the corner plot, the proposal would extend 2m and would add more bulk

and massing than the existing arrangement to the streetscene ensuring that it would appear as a dominant and uncharacteristic addition to the streetscene and its plot.

Paragraphs 5.1-5.6 of the SPD (pages 23-24) provides specific advice on single-storey rear extensions.

Generally, they should preserve an external passageway to the rear garden, a garden of reasonable size and be set behind the original building. Specifically, to single-storey rear extensions, they should be in keeping with the scale and style of the original host, not exceed 4m in ridge height, not exceed 2.5m height to eaves from ground level nor extend more than 4m from the rear for detached properties. In addition, a 1m gap to boundary should be retained. The rear extension would be limited in size and scale suitably compliant with the SPD. The proposed roof form would modestly reduce bulk and massing. While it would not have a significant property gap to the flank boundary to no. 45, this would not appear too dominant or overbearing being separated by no. 45's side driveway. The proposal seeks to remove the garage's built development so the extension would appear of an acceptable scale within its plot and would not have a significant visual impact to the streetscene as demonstrated by its lower flat roof profile and being set behind an existing outrigger projection.

The limited plot provides some significant constraints to the possible scale of the proposed built development without appearing as overdevelopment and this was noted within the previous similar application on the site. As previously discussed, the cumulative impact of the extensions would appear to create a visually unbalanced two-storey property to its neighbouring northwest bungalow at no. 55. In addition, it would create a dominant two-storey host within a very constrained plot with additional extensions to the front and rear eroding the original character and design of the property contrary to Key Design Principles 1 and 2 of the House Extensions and Alterations SPD. Whilst it is noted that the use of render finish to the elevations and red tile to the roof would echo the property's original character, this would not outweigh Officer concerns that the proposal would appear as a dominant and discordant addition in its limited plot and to the streetscene and fail to respect the original character and design of the host.

Considering the proposed fenestration, in the locality, houses typically have large bay windows to ground floor and a narrow pair of vertical windows with mullions or vertical pairs at ground aligned with the first floor. The proposed fenestration would appear to have a domestic style, while this would not be in keeping with the locality, Officers consider this to be relatively acceptable being limited visual impact to a detached building.

As such Officers recommend that should the application be otherwise supported that the garage should be demolished prior to the erection of the single-storey rear extension to avoid the visual harm of overdevelopment. In addition, if the application was supported, it would be recommended that further development of the host should be controlled in order to avoid detrimental visual impact on the original character and design of the host and the locality within this highly visible corner plot.

The proposed parking arrangement of two cars side by side to the side amenity would visually add the impression of vehicular clutter to the prominent plot however this would not appear unacceptably out of keeping considering local examples of similar parking arrangements.

By virtue of the scale, siting, form, and architectural features, the proposed development would fail to respect the original character and design of the host and would appear as a dominant, discordant and dominant feature in a prominent corner plot. Furthermore, due to the given features, the proposed structure would also appear visually incongruous within the streetscene, harming the visual character and appearance of the wider area. To approve the development would cause harm to visual amenity, in breach of the aims and objectives of Policies LP02 and LP24a) and b) of the Kirklees Local Plan, Key Design Principles 1 and 2 of the House Extensions and Alterations SPD and Government guidance contained within Chapter 12 of the NPPF.

3 – Impact on residential amenity:

Section B and C of Policy LP24 of the Kirklees Local Plan 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 135f of the National Planning Policy Framework 2021 states that planning decisions should ensure that developments have a high standard of amenity for existing and future users.

Key Design Principles 3-7 of the Kirklees Householder Extensions and Alterations SPD sets out expectations to support the above aims.

The proposed extensions and alterations are assessed upon whether they would have a detrimental effect on residential amenity, adjoining dwellings or any occupier of adjacent land by way of overshadowing, overbearing or overlooking and also in terms of its design, size and visual amenities.

No. 45 Park Road

This neighbour has a side elevation facing this proposed site, separated by a driveway of 3m width, with two centrally located windows to its attic. At present, no.47 is a bungalow set significantly back from the neighbouring front elevation and as such its roof ridge is set back past the windows. The proposal to extend no. 47 by one storey with a side gable roof close to the neighbouring window would lead to a limited loss of outlook due to the majority of its additional bulk and massing being set back past the windows as existing. This limited effect would not be regarded as significantly adding to an impression of overbearing and would be acceptable. No. 47 is the northwest of the neighbour and as such due to its position and orientation, would have a very restricted additional impact on overshadowing. There would be no additional windows facing this neighbour which would improve the existing relationship with overlooking and loss of privacy to this neighbour. There would be a new single-storey rear extension closer to the flank boundary but

separated by the driveway which would satisfactorily ensure that there would be no loss of outlook to this neighbour's rear elevation windows and no significant overbearing impact to this neighbour.

No. 11 Everard Street

The neighbour has its side elevation facing no. 47 and has one, narrow, first floor side window set modestly close to the rear and is separated by its driveway and a shared low stone wall. The proposed first floor windows would have some potential for overlooking to this window given the proximity of the two elevations separated by 9.9m at first storey; the two bathroom windows will be obscurely glazed however the bedroom windows would be clear glazed. It is not known from its glazed appearance, Council records or historic sales records whether no. 11's window serves a habitable room. Officers consider that bedroom one's window has the most potential for loss of privacy due to being the closest one to no. 11's side elevation window however this could be acceptable as they would only have oblique views. Bedroom two is at a sufficient distance so as to only have very oblique views of this window. It is noted that the additional windows would have some additional overlooking of no. 11's rear garden however in a finely balanced judgement, this would not introduce a substantially different relationship in terms of overlooking or loss of privacy to its existing neighbours. Due to no. 47's position approximately 9.9m (measured from the proposed two-storey host) to the northeast of no. 11, there would be no significant impact on overshadowing or overbearing.

55 Park Road

This property is separated by Everard Street and the proposal would still achieve 21.7m separation distance to its side elevation windows in full compliance with minimum expected separation distances between windows under paragraph 4.10 of the SPD. The distance between neighbours would also ensure no other additional residential amenity impacts.

Other Residential Properties

It is considered that the proposed development would be sited a sufficient distance away from any other neighbouring properties not referred to above so as to prevent undue harm to these properties in terms of loss of light, loss of privacy or overlooking, or the creation of an overbearing effect.

Future Occupiers

With reference to Key Design Principle 7 of the House Extensions and Alterations SPD, it is noted that *"extensions and alterations should ensure an appropriately sized and useable area of private outdoor space is retained. Normally at least half the garden area should be retained as part of the proposals."*

It is proposed to remove the garage for the single-storey rear extension to be added with an approximately equivalent footprint and could be considered to have a neutral impact for the current occupancy level. Officers note that the rear extension would have some minor improvements in privacy however it

would erode a very limited outdoor private amenity space further for an appropriately sized and useable area for future and present occupiers of a three bedroom property. This would be further limited by a parking space to this rear area.

As such, it is not considered the remaining useable amenity space for this limited plot coupled with its intensification in use and development over the existing arrangement is acceptable in this case and the resultant amenity space provision would not be private for users of the site and lead to pressure to create such space(s) through enclosing the site with high boundary treatments which would introduce a further issue in relation to the visual impact of the development of the corner plot site.

Should the proposal be considered otherwise acceptable, Officers recommend that a condition to have the garage removed prior to the erection of the rear extension and to remove Permitted Development Rights to limit further extensions within the small plot, would be required to preserve the future occupants residential amenity.

When considering the unacceptable impacts on residential amenity for present and future occupiers of no 47 with a reduced outside amenity area for its intensified occupancy of a three bedroom residence, it is concluded that the proposal would be contrary to LP24b) of the Kirklees Local Plan, Key Design Principle 7 of the House Extensions and Alterations SPD, and paragraph 135f) of Chapter 12 of the NPPF.

4 – Impact on highway safety:

Turning to highway safety and parking, policies seek to ensure that new developments have an acceptable impact on highway safety and provide sufficient parking. The Highways Design Guide SPD advises that new development should have sufficient off street parking spaces to meet need and to ensure on street parking impact is limited.

NPPF Chapter 9 requires the Council to consider the potential impacts of development on transport networks, and encourages walking, cycling and public transport use. Paragraph 115 of the NPPF provides guidance on the matter stating that:

“Development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe.”

For a three bedroom dwelling, it should have three off street parking spaces to achieve this aim. The proposal seeks to achieve two parking spaces in the rear/side amenity space and open up an existing driveway on Everard Street. The provision of parking within the side/rear amenity space would appear to have additional vehicular clutter within this space however this would be limited to three vehicles with some encroachment within the rear amenity space. The wider driveway with low boundary walls for visibility should enable

the occupiers to have a more satisfactory parking arrangement in terms of being able to park and access the highway. Whilst the existing driveway access from Everard Street has limited visibility due to the street tree northeast of the access, it would avoid additional impacts to the highway over and above existing.

Whilst bin storage have not been set out in plans, there is sufficient space within the remaining plot to have those stored safely behind the remaining boundary walls and to have arrangements remain as existing.

The increased width of the driveway would require amendments to the existing arrangements and therefore a footnote on s.184 agreements is recommended to advise the applicant of their responsibilities in this regard.

The development would be acceptable for Policy LP21 and LP22 of the Kirklees Local Plan, Key Design Principle 15 of the House Extensions and Alterations SPD, the aims of the Highways Design Guide SPD, and Chapter 9 of the NPPF.

5 – Other matters:

Climate Change

When determining planning applications, the Council will use the relevant Local Plan policies, the NPPF and guidance documents/SPDs to meet targets to achieve net zero carbon emissions. A Climate Change Statement has been supplied. Due to the limited nature of the development proposed, it is not considered that specific mitigation measures are required to facilitate this development.

Drainage

The site is within a low probability Flood Risk Zone and therefore to avoid further drainage issues, a condition would be placed to ensure that the additional parking spaces would be drained sufficiently and/or made permeable in accordance with Policies LP28 and LP34 of the Kirklees Local Plan, the Highways Design Guide SPD and Chapter 14 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Biodiversity

Whilst considering Biodiversity, Key Design Principles 12 –13 of the House Extensions and Alterations SPD in conjunction with LP 30 and LP 33 of the Kirklees Local Plan is relevant.

Whilst it is acknowledged that the site is located within an identified swift nesting area, the proposals are relatively modest to a single-storey bungalow and therefore considered unlikely that the proposals would have an impact on the swift population.

Should the proposal be otherwise acceptable, an informative would be recommended regarding the discovery of breeding birds during the works to adequately avoid detrimental impacts to swifts and other wild birds.

The small scale of the proposal would be on an existing hardsurface with no substantial impacts to existing vegetation or biodiversity. As such, it is

proposed that this would require no additional compensation or mitigation to improve biodiversity to make it acceptable in line with KDP 12-13 of the SPD and LP30 of the Kirklees Local Plan.

Trees

The application site is adjacent to Kirklees Council's street tree on Everard Street, which appears to be a healthy and well established sycamore and the property is already close to the canopy and roots. As such it would be considered a significant amenity tree under LP33 of the Kirklees Local Plan. The proposal seeks to have an additional storey to the bungalow with one window to its northwest elevation adjacent to the tree of a relatively limited canopy. In addition, the single-storey rear extension, on an existing footprint and its rooflights would be at an adequate distance away from the tree to avoid concerns being raised on leading to further pressure to the tree to be pruned and potentially damage its roots. Officers propose that this is acceptable in relation to LP24(i) and LP33 of the Kirklees Local Plan and Chapter 15 of the NPPF.

6 – Representations:

None received.

7 – Conclusion:

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 consideration.

By virtue of the scale, siting, form, and architectural features, the proposed development would fail to respect the original character and design of the host and would appear as a dominant, discordant and dominant feature in a prominent corner plot. Furthermore, due to the given features, the proposed structure would also appear visually incongruous within the streetscene, harming the visual character and appearance of the wider area. To approve the development would cause harm to visual amenity, in breach of the aims and objectives of Policies LP02 and LP24a) and b) of the Kirklees Local Plan, Key Design Principles 1 and 2 of the House Extensions and Alterations SPD and Government guidance contained within Chapter 12 of the NPPF.

The dwelling would provide a poor standard of outdoor amenity space and be significantly overlooked by neighbouring occupiers for such that it would fail to provide a high standard of amenity for future occupiers and would be contrary to policies LP1, LP2 and LP24 of the Kirklees Local Plan, Principles 6 and 17 of the Housebuilders Design Guide SPD and policies within Chapter 12 of the NPPF.

Recommendation

Refuse

Decision Authorisation - Delegated

Application Number: 2024/91097

Officer Recommendation: Refuse

Reasons

1. By virtue of the scale, siting, form, and architectural features, the proposed development would fail to respect the original character and design of the host and would appear as a dominant, discordant and dominant feature on a prominent corner plot. Furthermore, due to the design and detail, the proposed structure would appear visually incongruous within the streetscene, harming the visual character and

appearance of the wider area. To approve the development would cause harm to visual amenity, in breach of the aims and objectives of Policies LP02 and LP24a) and b) of the Kirklees Local Plan, Key Design Principles 1 and 2 of the House Extensions and Alterations SPD and Government guidance contained within Chapter 12 of the NPPF.

2. The proposal would lead to unacceptable impacts on residential amenity for present and future occupiers of no 47 as a result of not providing an useable and proportionate private outside amenity space for the level of proposed intensified occupancy. The proposal would be contrary to LP24b) of the Kirklees Local Plan, Key Design Principle 7 of the House Extensions and Alterations SPD, and paragraph 135f) of Chapter 12 of the NPPF.

Plans and specifications schedule:-

Plan Type	Reference	Version	Date Received
Location Plan.	Ref: 47 Park Road	Unamended	18/04/2024
Existing Floor Plans.	Ref: HD45DB47v4.	4	24/04/2024
Existing and Proposed Rear Elevation Plans.	Ref: HD45DB47v4.	4	29/04/2024
Existing and Proposed Front Elevation Plans.	Ref: HD45DB47.v4.	4	24/04/2024
Existing and Proposed Northwest Side Elevation Plans.	Ref: HD45DB7v4.	4	24/04/2024
Existing and Proposed Southeast Side Elevation Plans.	Ref: HD45DB47v4.	4	24/04/2024
Proposed Site Plan & Parking Layout.	Ref: HD45DB47v4.	4	24/04/2024
Proposed Ground Floor Plan.	Ref: HD45DB47v4.	4	24/04/2024
Proposed First Floor Plans.	Ref: HD45DB47v4.	4	24/04/2024
Design & Access Statement	Ref; 47 Park Road	Unamended	18/04/2024
Climate Change Statement	-	-	18/04/2024

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. The agent was notified of the likely Refusal

based on submitted plans and was provided with advised amendments to secure a more positive outcome. An Extension of Time request and/or amended plans was not supplied so Officers proceeded to determination to meet the initial target date.

Report Dated: 24/06/2024