

**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:	2025/62/90370/E
Site Address:	15, Coppin Hall Lane, Mirfield, WF14 0EL
Description:	Erection of single storey rear extension and existing dormers and alterations to roof
Recommending Officer:	Elenya Jackson

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.

Emma Thompson

AUTHORISED OFFICER

Date: 16-Apr-2025

OFFICER REPORT

Site Description

15, Coppin Hall Lane, Mirfield, WF14 0EL is a 1.5 storey detached dwelling which currently benefits from a private rear garden, front garden and driveway.

The property is constructed out of red brick and is modest in scale in the context of its plot. The application form associated with this application states there is render on the host property however officers did not see this on their visit.

The street scene is not uniform in appearance with dwellings of varying scale, design and materials; however, the area is predominantly residential in character.

Description of Proposal

This application has been received for Erection of single storey rear extension and existing dormers and alterations to roof.

The proposal would alter the roof from a hipped roof to a pitched roof with gable ends on the eastern and western elevation. This would increase the height of the dwelling from 6.9m to 7.2m.

The proposal would feature a dormer on its rear elevation which would extend 2.2m beyond the roof plane, have a height of 1.63m and a width of 9.2m.

The dormer on the front of the dwelling would project 2.1m, have a width of 9.2m and a height of 1.5m

The proposal would remove the existing bay windows to the principal elevation of the dwelling and introduce a central 1.5 storey glazed projection.

This would create a gable end facing the street scene that would project 1.1m with a width of 2.6m , a maximum height of 5.3m.

The previously refused scheme featured a similar projection however this had a maximum height of 7.6m with a width of 2.5m.

The proposal also features an infill extension at ground floor level which would project 2.2m beyond the rear elevation of the house, resulting in it appearing flush with the rear of the dwelling. The extension would have a width of 6.9m and increase the eaves from 3m to 3.4m.

The previously refused scheme on site increased the eaves height of the dwelling to 4.8m and the overall height of the dwelling to 8.3m.

The application form delineates that materials would be red brick and render with grey upvc dormer cheeks.

Relevant Planning History

2023/62/92575/E: Erection of single storey rear extension, alterations to front fenestration and increase roof height to increase first floor accommodation
Refused.

Representations

The application was initially advertised by site notice which expired on 28/03/2025

No comments received

Consultation Responses

N/A

Negotiations

N/A

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 Proposals Map.

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.

Kirklees Local Plan Policies

- **LP 1** – Achieving sustainable development
- **LP 2** – Place shaping
- **LP 22** – Parking
- **LP 24** - Design
- **LP22**- Parking
- **LP53**- Contaminated and unstable land

Kirklees Council adopted supplementary planning guidance on house extensions on 29th June 2021 which now carries full weight in decision making. This guidance indicates how the Council will usually interpret its policies regarding such built development, although the general thrust of the advice is aligned with both the Kirklees Local Plan (KLP) and the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), requiring development to be considerate in terms of the character of the host property and the wider street scene.

National Policies and Guidance:

National planning policy and guidance is set out in National Policy Statements, primarily the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) published December 2024, and 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 12 – Achieving well-designed and beautiful places

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
- 5) Representations
- 6) Negotiations
- 7) Conditions
- 8) Conclusion

1 – Principle of development:

The site is without notation on the Kirklees Local Plan (KLP). Policy LP1 of the KLP states that when considering development proposals, the Council will take a positive approach that reflects the presumption in favour of sustainable development contained in the NPPF. In terms of extending and making alterations to a property, Policy LP24 of the KLP is relevant, in conjunction with the House Extensions and Alterations SPD and Chapter 12 of the NPPF, regarding design. In this case, the principle of development is considered acceptable, and the proposal shall now be assessed against all other material planning considerations, including visual and residential amenity, as well as highway safety.

These issues along with other policy considerations will be addressed below.

2 –Impact on visual amenity:

It is considered that the House Extension and Alterations SPD is relevant in this instance as the proposal would be a alterations to existing dwellings.

Key Design Principle 1 of the House Extension & Alterations SPD states that extensions and alterations to residential properties should be in keeping with the appearance, scale, design and local character of the area and the street scene.

As previously highlighted, there has been a recent previous refusal on site which was assessed as follows:

‘ The most significant aspect of the proposal would be the alterations to the principal elevation of the dwelling and the increase to the height of the dwelling.

The existing dwelling is 1.5 storeys, red brick, features a hipped roof and a small dormer to the principal elevation. The proposal would introduce significant amounts of render, altering the external appearance of the dwelling. It is considered that rendering all elevations of the dwelling is unsympathetic to the original appearance of the dwelling. The application form details the existing dwelling features render; however, this was not apparent to officers when conducting a site visit and the extent of the materials proposed are out of character with the existing building, and would not retain the red brick character of the dwelling.

The proposal would increase the internal footprint of the dwelling from 113m² to approximately 167m² and a volume increase from approximately 442m³ to approximately 612.8m³ (this excludes the dormers).

Section 5.2 of the HEASPD refers to front extensions and states that front extensions will not normally be permitted unless 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. The proposal would feature one gable to the principal elevation of the dwelling which would not be set

within the original roof plane of the dwelling or set above the original eaves. Due to the gable extending from the ground floor wall of the dwelling, the alterations would be read as a two storey addition within the street scene, adding a vertical emphasis to the property which does not currently exist. This would fail to be subservient and would significantly alter the character of the existing dwelling.

In addition to the above, the proposal would not retain any of the original roof form or design in order to accommodate a full first floor increasing the property to a two-storey dwelling.

It is considered that the increased sense of scale created by the large front facing gable, design of the roof, the increase in height, the introduction of render and the overly vertical emphasis/contrast with the existing development would be considerable, unbalancing the property and appearing incongruous and out of character within the street scene.

It has been considered whether the proposal could be constructed with the fall back of permitted development. Schedule 2, Part 1, Class AA of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 as amended (the GPDO), permits development consisting of the enlargement of a dwellinghouse by construction of up to one additional storey, where the existing dwellinghouse comprises of one storey, together with any reasonably necessary engineering operations Paragraph AA.2.(3)(a)(ii) – of Class AA relates to the external appearance of the dwellinghouse. As the report previously highlighted, the proposal would not integrate with the character of the existing dwelling and would be an unsympathetic and overly dominant addition to the host dwelling. It is therefore considered that the proposal could not be constructed under Class AA of the GDPO.

It is accepted that there are two storey buildings within the vicinity of the dwelling. However, these dwellings do not have such a horizontal emphasis as the application property and are not within the immediate building group, nor share the same orientation. Officers consider that the increased sense of scale created by the large front facing gable, the vertical emphasis and contrast with the surrounding scale and massing of built development would be considerable. The proposal would subsequently result in the application property appearing incongruous in its plot in comparison to neighbouring properties within the street scene’.

Section 5.2 of the House Extensions and Alterations SPD refers to front extensions and states they would only be appropriate where the house is set back, well screened, the materials match and would not impact neighbouring properties.

Officers consider that the proposed front extension would largely be within the plane of the existing dwelling, and although it would extend above the eaves of the host dwelling, it is considered that the alteration would not result in the dwelling appearing disproportionately larger than the existing building in terms of its vertical emphasis. This element of the proposal has been reduced in height since the previous submission.

Section 5.4 of the HEASPD refers to dormer windows and roof extensions and states that careful consideration is required as they can have significantly

impact on the character of the area which is particularly relevant to bungalows.

Officers consider that, there would be a limited increase to the maximum height of the dwelling which would not prevent it from integrating with the prevailing street scene. The roof alterations would alter the character of the property, but due to the alterations not having such an overly vertical emphasis as the previously refused scheme and there being examples of gable ends facing into the street scene, officers consider that the proposal would be acceptable in this instance.

Previously the proposed materials raised concerns for officers due to the materials not being prevalent within the vicinity. It is considered that the scale of the proposal has been reduced which would reduce the proposal's prominence and render it could be considered acceptable in this instance.

Having taken the above into account, subject to conditions, the proposed development would integrate with the host dwelling and the wider street scene, thus

complying with Policy LP24 of the KLP and the aims of Chapter 12 of the NPPF.

3 – Impact on residential amenity:

Consideration in relation to the impact on the residential amenity of neighbouring occupants shall now be set out, taking into account policy LP24 c), which sets out that proposals should promote good design by, amongst other things, extensions minimising impact on residential amenity of future and neighbouring occupiers. The House Extension & Alterations SPD goes into further detail with respect to Key Design Principle 3 on privacy, Key Design Principle 5 on overshadowing/loss of light and Key Design Principle 6 on preventing overbearing impact.

Impact on 1 & 2 Coppin Hall Grove : These properties adjoin the application property to the north. The rear garden of this property adjoins the shared boundary of the dwellings.

Overlooking: The proposal would feature two side facing windows. These would be for a dining kitchen at ground floor level. This could be conditioned to be obscured; however, officers consider that the boundary treatment would likely be sufficient to mitigate impact. The upper floor windows will not result in any greater loss of privacy when taking into account the angle and relationship to the garden areas.

Overshadowing/loss of light: The proposal would be located to the east of No.1 and 2 and have an increase in height of 30cm. It is considered that there is an offset relationship between the dwellings and the increase in scale of the proposal would be marginal in this instance. Therefore, no significant issues would be raised regarding overshadowing/loss of light.

Overbearing: The proposal would be situated 3m off of the shared boundary between the dwellings and 10m from the rear elevation. It is considered that

the increase in height would not give rise to an unacceptable overbearing relationship or loss of privacy for the occupiers of no.1 and no. 2

Impact on 5 Coppin Hall Grove: is located to the rear of the property. It is considered that, the property increase in height would be marginal, the existing separation distance between the dwellings would be retained and no significant issues would arise regarding the residential amenity of the occupiers of no.5. The additional windows at first floor level will not result in any reduction in privacy due to the existing relationship of rear window as well as distance maintained.

Impact on 13 Coppin Hall Lane: adjoins the application site to the south east. Due to the change in ground levels at the site, the application property sits at a higher level than no.13.

Overlooking: The proposal would feature one side facing windows for a bathroom This could be conditioned to be obscured and therefore, no significant issues would arise regarding overlooking. The additional windows at first floor level will not result in any reduction in privacy to the adjoining dwelling or garden due to the existing relationship of rear windows to garden spaces in the area.

Overshadowing/loss of light/overbearing. The proposal would be located to the north west of no.13 which has one side facing window. The infill extension would be located adjacent to this window; using the planning history associated with this address officers have deduced that this is likely to be a bedroom window.

The development proposed would continue the existing relationship between the dwellings in terms of retaining a 3.9m spacing between the two and would create a marginal increase in height. Officers acknowledge that the proposal would amend the roof from a hipped roof to a pitched roof, this would bring the main dwelling closer to the shared boundary between the dwellings above the eaves height to allow for a gable to be created. In assessing the impact of the development, it's design and mass as well as location adjacent to 13, Officers have afforded weight to boundary treatment that could be erected in front of the existing window. This would be closer to the habitable window whereas the development propose allows a gap to be maintained. Other development that would similarly impact could also be constructed without planning permission and should be avoided to provide a better planning balance. In maintaining the gap outlook and amenity for the neighbouring occupants is achieved and the development can, on balance, be supported subject a condition removing permitted development rights. In view of this balance and subject to the condition the development will be adequately mitigated and is not considered to detrimentally impact due to the combination of the gap maintained and scale plus location of the development.

The previous application was refused due to concerns regarding the residential amenity of neighbouring dwellings; however, officers consider that the proposal has been significantly reduced in scale, as well as conditioned,

to overcome these concerns. There have been no representations received in respect of the development proposals.

It is considered that, due to the scale of the proposal and its location within the plot

Due to the scale and location of the proposal within the plot, there would not be any additional properties impacted by the proposal.

4 – Impact on highway safety:

The proposal would increase the scale of the dwelling; however, sufficient parking space would be retained for three vehicles and therefore the proposal is considered to be acceptable from a highways perspective and in accordance with Policies LP21 and LP22 of the Kirklees Local Plan.

The proposal would therefore comply with Policy LP22 of the Kirklees Local Plan along with Key Design Principles 15 & 16 of the House Extensions and Alterations SPD.

5– Other matters:

Carbon Budget

The proposal is an extension to existing buildings. As such, no special measures were 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.

6 – Representations:

N/A

7 – Negotiations:

N/A

8 – 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.

As set out above, 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.

Recommendation

APPROVE

Decision Authorisation - Delegated Powers

Application Number: 2025/90370

Officer Recommendation: Approve

Conditions and Reasons:

1. The development hereby permitted shall be begun within three years of the date of this permission.

Reason: Pursuant to the requirements of Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

1. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in complete accordance with the plans and specifications listed in this decision notice, except as may be specified in the conditions attached to this permission, which shall in all cases take precedence.

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt as to what is being permitted and so as to ensure the satisfactory appearance of the development on completion, and to accord with Policies LP1, LP2, LP24 of the Kirklees Local Plan and advice within the National Planning Policy Framework.

2. The development shall be constructed with all external facing materials matching the original host dwelling.

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt as to what is being permitted and so as to ensure the satisfactory appearance of the development on completion, and to accord with Policies LP1, LP2, LP24 and LP57 of the Kirklees Local Plan and advice within the National Planning Policy Framework.

4. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 as amended (or any Order revoking or re-enacting that Order) no development included within Classes A – G of Part 1 of Schedule 2 to that Order shall be carried out within the red line boundary of the site.

Reason: To ensure that unsatisfactory extensions and outbuildings do not have an unacceptable impact on the amenities of the neighbouring properties, and due to the planning balance on this specific site, in accordance with the requirements of Policy LP24 of the Kirklees Local Plan and the provisions of the Housebuilders Design Guide SPD.

Plans and specifications schedule:

Plan Type	Reference	Version	Date
Location Plan			19/02/2025
Block Plan			19/02/2025
Proposed elevations and floor plans	5101/RR/SS		19/02/2025
Climate change statement			19/02/2025

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 has, 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.

Officers did not request revisions as no revisions required.