

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:	2024/62/91775/W
Site Address:	2, Poplar Avenue, Thongsbridge, Holmfirth, HD9 7TL
Description:	Erection of single storey side extension
Recommending Officer:	Tom Hunt

DECISION – Conditional Full Permission

I hereby authorise the approval of this application for the reasons set out in the officer's report and recommendation annexed below in respect of the above matter.

Sarah Longbottom

AUTHORISED OFFICER

Date: 07-Aug-2024

HOUSEHOLDER DELEGATED REPORT

Application Number	2024/91775
Location	2, Poplar Avenue, Thongsbridge, Holmfirth, HD9 7TL
Proposal	Erection of single storey side extension
Publicity end date	06/08/2024
Number of representations received	0
Kirklees Local Plan Allocation/Designation	Unallocated for development.
Extension to Time (EoT)	N/A
Recommendation	Conditional Full Permission

	NO	YES
Applicant a Council Member or Officer in Investment and Regeneration (Skills and Regeneration)	✓	
Contrary to previous decision	✓	
Called in by Ward Member	✓	
Significant number of representations received	✓	

If 'No' to all above, proceed with a fast track report

By indicating that the development proposal complies with relevant national and local policy and the 'House Extensions and Alterations' Supplementary Planning Document, the planning officer is taking into account the information submitted with the application, any previous relevant applications, observations during any site visit, any comments received in connection with the application and any other considerations which are material to the decision.

Policy

National

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) December 2023
National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG)

- NPPF Chapter 2 – Achieving sustainable development
- NPPF Chapter 12 – Achieving well-designed and beautiful places
- NPPF Chapter 14 – Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change
- NPPF Chapter 15 – Conserving and enhancing the natural environment

Local

Kirklees Local Plan (LP):

- **LP 1** – Achieving sustainable development
- **LP 2** – Place shaping
- **LP 21** – Highways and access
- **LP 22** – Parking
- **LP 24** – Design
- **LP 30** – Biodiversity and Geodiversity

Holme Valley Neighbourhood Development Plan (HVNDP):

- Policy 1 – Protecting and Enhancing the Landscape Character of Holme Valley.
- Policy 2 – Protecting and Enhancing the Built Character of the Holme Valley and Promoting High Quality Design.
- Policy 12 – Promoting Sustainability.
- Policy 13 – Protecting Wildlife and Securing Biodiversity Net Gain.

Landscape character area 4: River Holme Settled Valley Floor

Supplementary Planning Document 'House Extensions and Alterations' (2021).

- Key design principle 1: Local character and street scene
- Key design principle 2: Impact on the original house
- Key design principle 3: Privacy
- Key design principle 4: Habitable rooms and side windows
- Key design principle 5: Overshadowing/loss of light
- Key design principle 6: Preventing overbearing impact
- Key design principle 7: Outdoor space
- Key design principle 8: Energy efficiency
- Key design principle 9: Construction materials
- Key design principle 10: Renewable energy
- Key design principle 11: Water retention
- Key design principle 12: Natural environment

- Key design principle 13: Vegetation and tree planting
- Key design principle 14: Drainage and flood risk
- Key design principle 15: Provision for parking
- Key design principle 16: Provision for waste storage
- Key design principle 17: Access for all users

	YES / NO	SUMMARY
Negotiations/Amendments during course of application	No	n/a
Parish/Town Council comments sought (Holme Valley Parish Council)	Yes	Support
Planning History	No	N/A
Consultations required	No	N/A

Assessment

The Kirklees SPD sets out that single storey side extensions should comply with certain dimensions set out at paragraph 5.17 on page 28 (and listed below) and if they do not, they need to be justified:

Single-storey side extensions should:	<u>Yes - COMPLY</u>	<u>No - JUSTIFY</u>
not extend more than two thirds of the width of the original house; and	Yes	
not exceed a height of 4 metres;		No – This would be 4.8m overall height however this would follow the pitch of the host roof, be seen as a diminutive addition and perpendicular to the highway would not appear to contribute towards terracing
be set back at least 500mm from the	Yes	

original building line to allow for a visual break.		
---	--	--

The SPD sets out advice for corner plots set out in paragraph 5.23 on page 30 (and listed below) and if they do not, they need to be justified:

Side extensions should contribute to the local character by	<u>Yes - COMPLY</u>	<u>No - JUSTIFY</u>
Facing in both directions to create two frontages, each with windows overlooking the street;		No – the extension would not have windows facing the highway however Officers propose that this is acceptable as it would face a high hedging boundary treatment and visually be of low impact.
Being set back from the existing building line on both streets; and		No – It would not be set back on Woodlands Avenue however on the west side of the Avenue, adjacent properties do not have a strong building line and are within generous grounds separating those to diffuse the building line further. It would be substantially set back from the building frontage on Popular Avenue. The high quality scheme would not appear incongruous given the diffuse building line and separation of properties.
Following the boundary treatment along both streets, in relation to its position, height and materials.	Yes – the boundary treatment would be unaffected	

Design and Visual Amenity: Are the considerations in the following table acceptable?

Application site is on a cornerplot. It is within a cul-de-sac of similar stone-built, bungalows and separated by Woodland Avenue, adjacent to two-storey stone built terraced. On the west side of the Avenue, adjacent highway properties do not have a strong building line and are within generous grounds separating those to diffuse the building line further.

Consideration has been given here in terms of the proposals impact on the local character and street scene, including subservience, terracing and building line.

	Relevant key design principle (KDP) of the SPD, Policy in the Kirklees Local Plan and the NPPF	Further comments	✓ / X / N/A
Impact on the Local character and street scene	• KDP1 of the SPD • Policy LP24 Design (a) and (c) of the KLP • Chapter 12 NPPF	No clear building line to the row of properties. Replacement for poor quality conservatory for one of a higher design quality.	✓
Impact on original house	• KDP2 of the SPD • Policy LP24 Design (c) and (d) of the KLP • Chapter 12 of the NPPF	Would appear subservient by virtue of its width, height and substantial set back to the original building.	✓
Height, scale and massing	• KDP 1 and 2 of the SPD • Policy LP24 Design (a), (c) and (d) of the KLP • Chapter 12 of the NPPF	As above.	✓
Facing materials and detailing	• KDP 9 of the SPD • Policy LP24 Design (d) (iii) of the KLP • Chapter 12 of the NPPF	The submitted details indicate that the extension is to be faced in render. Although the existing boundary hedge would provide some screening, the property has a relatively	X

		prominent siting and there are no examples of render within the immediate vicinity. In order for the proposal to be in keeping with the character and appearance of the host dwelling and area, it is considered reasonable to request the extension is faced in matching materials (stone and brick). This could be addressed by condition.	
Roof style	• KDP 1 and 2 of the SPD • Policy LP24 Design (a), (c) and (d) of the KLP • Chapter 12 of the NPPF	Set down pitch roof which matches the existing in pitch and style.	✓
Window proportions	• KDP 1 and 2 of the SPD • Policy LP24 Design (a), (c) and (d) of the KLP • Chapter 12 of the NPPF	Proportions match the existing property.	✓
Accessibility for all users	• KDP 17 of the SPD • Policy LP24 Design (f) • Chapter 12 of the NPPF	Private domestic extension which would not change the existing access into / around the property.	✓

The design of the proposal is therefore acceptable and accords with policies LP24 of the adopted Kirklees Local Plan, the SPD and the NPPF.

Residential Amenity: Are the considerations in the following table acceptable?

The main properties affected are:

- *No. 1 Beech Avenue – neighbour is to the east and separated by the highway and the extension would not have side elevation windows. The separation distance and orientation of the side extension is such that it would not unduly overbear, overlook or overshadow*

- *No. 1 Poplar Avenue – neighbour is to the south separated by the highway. The new side extension windows would have a separation distance in excess of 21m and be screened by their own hedging boundary treatment to this neighbour. No overlooking, overshadowing and overbearing impacts.*
- *No. 4 Poplar Avenue – paired neighbour to the west. Extension would be screened by the host 's own bulk and massing to avoid overlooking, overshadowing and overbearing impacts.*

	Relevant key design principle (KDP) of the SPD, Policy in the Kirklees Local Plan and the NPPF	Further comments	✓ / X / N/A
Impact on privacy of neighbours (to sides, rear and front)	• KDP 3 & 4 of the SPD • Policy LP24 Design (d) (iv) • Chapter 12 of the NPPF	Acceptable for the reasons set out above.	✓
Impact on light and outlook of neighbours (to sides, rear and front)	• KDP 4, 5, 6 of the SPD • Policy LP24 Design (b) • Chapter 12 of the NPPF	As above.	✓
Remaining garden space of application property	• KDP 7 of the SPD • Policy LP24 Design (b) and (c) • Chapter 12 of the NPPF	Rear garden would not be significantly impacted by the small scale side extension.	✓

The proposal is therefore acceptable in terms of residential amenity and accords with policy LP24 of the adopted Kirklees Local Plan, the SPD and the NPPF.

Highways and Parking: Are the following acceptable?

	Relevant key design principle (KDP) of the SPD, Policy in the Kirklees Local Plan and the NPPF	Further comments	✓ / X / N/A
Impact on highway safety	• KDP 15 of the SPD	N/A	✓

	• Policy LP22 Parking (f) of the KLP • Chapter 12 of the NPPF		
Parking provision	• KDP 15 of the SPD • Policy LP22 Parking (f) of the KLP • Chapter 12 of the NPPF	Through internal reconfiguration of rooms and the side extension, property would have two additional bedrooms for a new three bedroom property. Adequate parking for this increase is set out to the rear.	✓
Provision for waste storage	• KDP 16 of the SPD • Policy LP24 Design (d) (iv) • Chapter 12 of the NPPF	None shown on plans however, there is sufficient space within the red line boundary to allow for storage on site to be as existing. Condition not considered necessary.	✓

The proposal is therefore acceptable in terms of highways and parking and accords with policies LP21 and LP22 of the adopted Kirklees Local Plan, the SPD and the NPPF.

Other matters: Are the following acceptable?

	Relevant key design principle (KDP) of the SPD, Policy in the Kirklees Local Plan and the NPPF	Further comments	✓ / X / N/A
Impact on trees	• KDP 13 of the SPD • Policy LP24 Design (d) (i) (iv) Policy LP33 Trees • Chapter 12 of the NPPF	N/A	N/A
Impact on ecology	• KDP 12 of the SPD • Policy LP30 • Chapter 15 of the NPPF	Bat Alert layer - The building is in good order, well-sealed and unlikely to have any significant bat roost potential. A cautionary	✓

		note is recommended.	
Carbon Budget / Climate change statement	• KDP 8, 9, 10 & 11 of the SPD • Policy LP51 • Chapter 14 of the NPPF	Small scale domestic development to an existing dwelling. As such, no special measures required in terms of the planning application with regards to carbon emissions. However, there are controls in terms of Building Regulations which will need to be adhered to as part of the construction process which will require compliance with national standards.	✓
Drainage and Flood Risk	• KDP 14 of the SPD • Policy LP24 (d) (vii), LP27 and LP34 of the KLP	The rear garden and landscaping would be retained to allow for run-off. The site is in a low probability area for flooding.	✓

The proposal is therefore acceptable in terms of the above listed other matters and accords with policies set out in the Kirklees Local Plan, the SPD and the NPPF.

Representations, including Parish/Town Council comments:

Summary of Representation	Officer response	Addressed ✓ / X / N/A
Holme Valley Parish Council – Support	Noted	✓

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 would constitute sustainable development and is therefore recommended for approval.

Plan Type	Reference	Version	Date Received
Climate Change Statement			24/06/2024

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. It was not considered necessary to seek any amendments/further information during the course of this application.

Report Dated: 07/08/2024