

Kirklees Council

Development Management

02 May 2025

Our Ref; HPS7824

FAO Nicole Helliwell

Dear Nicole

Application 2025/90893 – 7 Frank Lane, Thornhill

I refer to the above application. I have again been instructed by _____ who reside at _____

We raised objections to the earlier proposed application number 2024/91644/E. These objections were taken on board by the applicants and revised plans were submitted. My clients considered that the then application (as revised) was at the absolute limit of what was appropriate or desirable for the area, and for the plot, that forms number 7, but decided that they would not raise any further objections, and the application was duly granted.

My clients are surprised to find that the applicants have now submitted a substantially revised application, which effectively creates a 3rd floor as living space. No supporting planning information has been submitted to assess how the proposed extensions would meet Local Plan Policy and the Council's residential Extensions SPD.

Number 7 Frank Lane is currently a 3-bedroom semi-detached house occupied by a family _____ It has two reception rooms, a dining kitchen, 3 bedrooms (2 doubles 1 single) and one bathroom. The 2024 application would have created a very substantially larger house of 3 living areas, a dining kitchen, downstairs toilet, utility pantry, mud room, 4 double bedrooms a large dressing area and 2 upstairs bathrooms. A large property for one family, but just about in keeping with the plot and area.

The 2025 application goes even further and seeks to create **in addition** a storage room / area and office (the size of a double bedroom) a shower room, a double bedroom and a large dressing room. If the office, storage room and dressing area, were in fact used as bedrooms there would be 7/8 bedrooms 3 bathrooms and a downstairs WC.

Further it seeks to extend the single storey ground floor extension over and above that allowed in 2024 and proposes substantial alterations to the roof line on both the Western and Southern elevations. The pitch of the proposed roof on the southern elevation is much steeper and is altogether a much larger roof. It is worthy of mention that I am advised that the applicants did previously agree to reduce the size of the proposed 2024 single storey extension from that originally envisaged but have now returned to the original. This is apparent from the 3 windows on the southern side of the western elevation, in contrast to 2 windows, in the 2024 permission.

It is apparent when viewing the proposed roof on the western elevation that it is much higher than the 2024 roof. The height of the 2024 roof taken from ground floor to the ridge of the gable on the scale plan is 22mm. The height of the proposed roof is 27 mm.

It must be remembered that this is currently a modest 3-bedroomed semi of circa 1145 sq. ft and is on a plot suitable for such a property. It is not a detached property that can be altered without impact on adjoining neighbours. There are no measurements on the plans seeking permission, so it is difficult to scale off, but my guestimate is that the proposed property would be circa 3500 sq. ft. I would request that the applicants confirm the exact size of the proposed property before the application is considered.

When the 2024 application was submitted my clients were naturally concerned about the impact and the cosmetic effect of the substantial alterations. They decided that whilst there would of course be an impact that the application (as revised) was a compromise, that was just about tolerable, from their point of view. It allowed the creation of a very substantial property but preserved architectural integrity and was more or less in keeping with the character of the local area.

I refer you to the House and Extensions Alteration SPD

Local Policy

1.8(a) The form, SCALE*, layout and details of all development respects and enhances the character of the townscape, heritage, assets and landscape (*my emphasis)

1.8(c) Extensions are SUBSERVIENT *to the original building, are in keeping with the existing building in terms of scale, materials and details and minimise impact on residential amenity of future and neighbouring occupants (*my emphasis)

4.2 The local context, character and identity of the area will be a significant factor in determining the appropriate form and scale of house extensions and alterations.

5.1 Rear extensions should maintain the quality of the residential environment and relate well to the neighbouring buildings

5.2 As a general rule, a rear extension should respect the original house and garden in terms of its size and scale

5.8 two storey rear extensions will be considered based on the extent of overshadowing, loss of privacy and outlook

5.28 Balconies and roof terraces should not negatively affect neighbouring properties or alter the local character of the area

Key Design Principle 1

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

Key Design Principle 2

Extensions should not dominate or be larger than the original house and should be in keeping the existing building in terms of scale material and details

Key Design Principle 3

Extensions and Alterations should be designed to achieve reasonable levels of privacy for both inhabitants' future occupants and neighbours

Key Design Principle 5

Extensions and Alterations should not adversely affect the amount of natural light presently enjoyed by neighbouring properties

Key Design Principle 15

Extensions and Alterations should maintain appropriate access and off street, in curtilage, parking proposals should not result in street scenes dominated by large areas of hard surface and parked cars



Frank Lane

This is a residential road made up of a variety of styles of property. The majority are 2,3 4, or perhaps as many as 5, bedroomed. There is one substantial property at the corner of Frank Lane and Valley Road, but this is a detached property set in its own grounds. To the best of my client's knowledge there are no 7/8 bedroomed properties and certainly no 7/8 bedroomed semi-detached properties.

My clients object to the application on the following grounds :-

1. It is not in keeping with the general principles set out in the House and extensions alterations SPD.
2. It amounts to gross over development of a modest property on a modest site .
3. It is not in keeping with other properties in the local area.
4. The southern aspect lacks any form of aesthetic or architectural appeal and is out of character. In my client's opinion the 2024 permission created a southern aspect that was architecturally pleasing. It incorporates two gable roofs which would complement gable roof and windows of an interesting design. The same cannot be said of the proposed roof which would be out of character with the existing property. Further as the roof is much larger, and the pitch much steeper, it would take even more light from
5. The three proposed dormers, at a substantial height, will substantially interfere with my client's privacy and outlook.
6. The dormers will further reduce the light to , over and above the impact of the alterations permitted by the 2024 planning permission.
7. The proposed property will have the capacity to house many people -this will result in the need for additional parking which will either require hard standing alterations at the front or on street parking. The guidance suggests that 4+ bedrooms require 3 off street parking spaces, but does not cater for 7/8 bedroomed properties, which presumably would need 5/6 parking spaces within curtilage. I am informed that even now visitors often park on the road, a situation that would only become worse if the number of residents were to increase.
8. The alterations as proposed will result in sound travelling from the enhanced usage of number 7 -in particular if the rooms in the proposed 3rd floor were in fact all used as bedrooms. Further the position of the proposed utility room will cause sound from eg. washing machines to travel into

9. The proposed balcony is larger than that envisaged by the 2024 application. This seems to be completely unnecessary. It is important to maintain the requirement for opaque glass.

Concluding comments

In summary, the proposals are not subservient to the original building, the scale is out of all proportion to the existing property, the southern aspect is aesthetically unappealing lacking symmetry and out of character to the existing building and area.

It is worthy of mention that my clients remain concerned that the building will be too close to the boundary. It is most important that the existing boundary wall is preserved and that any building works should allow sufficient room for access to the wall.

We trust these comments will be fully considered and the application refused.

Yours sincerely,

Chartered Town Planner