

Our Ref: 24D07
Date: 14.04.2025

PLANNING STATEMENT

For a

VARIATION OF A CONDITION (SECTION 73) APPLICATION

For

PLANNING APPLICATION REFERENCE 2022/93578

*'ERECTION OF SIDE EXTENSION, FIRST FLOOR BALCONY, AND
EXTERNAL ALTERATIONS'*

At

*32, THE PADDOCK, KIRHEATON, HUDDERSFIELD
HD5 0ER*

1.0 Proposed Amendments

- 1.1 This Statement has been prepared in support of a Variation of a Condition (Section 73) Application for 32 The Paddock, Kirkheaton, in support of existing approved Planning Application 2022/62/93578/W. The description of the development is for the 'Erection of side extension, first floor balcony, and external alterations'.
- 1.2 The proposal is to vary Condition 02 which states that the 'development hereby permitted shall be carried out in complete accordance with the plans and specifications schedule listed in the decision notice...' which include the 'Proposed Plans and Elevations' (reference 22D15-FBA-22-XX-DR-A-2001 Rev P06) and the 'Proposed Site Layout' (reference 22D15-FBA-22-XX-DR-A-2002 Rev P03) as well as the Existing Plans and Elevations. It is proposed that the Proposed Plans and Elevations drawing is amended to a later revision of the drawing '24D07-FBA-ZZ-XX-DR-A-2001 Rev. P06) and that the Proposed Site Layout is amended to a later revision of the drawing '24D07-FBA-ZZ-XX-DR-A-2002 Rev. P03'.
- 1.3 Amendments from the original drawings include the following:
 - A) All Elevations – Material Tags added for additional clarity
 - B) Front Elevation Amendments – Slight amendments to materials to better reflect road scene; minor tweak to proposed ground floor window; rainwater pipes included for clarity; ridge of extension raised slightly to provide better accommodation quality and match adjacent houses and road scene.
 - C) Proposed Side 1 Elevation – Minor amendments to external material of existing house first floor; one window to ground floor amended to higher level for privacy; balcony omitted; rainwater pipes included for clarity; ridge of extension raised slightly as mentioned in B) and roof pitches amended to suit
 - D) Proposed Rear Elevation – Balcony omitted; location of bi-folding doors amended; first floor window position amended; rooflights added to rear elevation of roof; rainwater pipes included for clarity; ridge of extension raised slightly as mentioned in B)
 - E) Proposed Side 2 Elevation – Balcony omitted; ridge of extension raised slightly as mentioned in B), rainwater pipes included for clarity.
 - F) Proposed Ground Floor – Minor Internal Alterations and Reconfigurations
 - G) Proposed First Floor Plan – Minor Internal Alterations and Reconfigurations including removal of balcony
 - H) Roof Plan – Roof Amended as described above

Please note, the number of bedrooms remains at 3No. as per the original application.

2.0 Justification

- 2.1 Kirklees SPD 'House Extensions and Alterations SPD' (June 2021) sets out the guidelines for the design of extensions within Kirklees for Planning Purposes. The SPD has been considered in the above amendments.
- 2.2 LP24 Design sets out the LPA's policy for the design of extensions. It stipulates the following points a. to c. which are shown in italics, which are answered individually to justify this extension:

'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;'*

The revised form of the extension better compliments the adjacent houses to provide a more consistent street scene. Consider the following:

1. The revised Proposal includes cladding to the side of the first floor window to match the other houses adjacent, whereas the original proposal included the whole of the first floor clad on the front elevation
2. The ridge height of the extension better matches the adjacent properties, that have a ridge height above the height of the original house. For example, properties No. 30 The Paddock, No. 28 The Paddock, No. 26 The Paddock, No. 24 The Paddock, No. 23 The Paddock, No. 25 The Paddock, No. 27 The Paddock, No. 29 The Paddock, No. 33 The Paddock, and No. 36 The Paddock. The ridge height of all of these assumed extensions appears to be higher than the original build. An image of these houses in the Street Scene is shown in Figure 01.
3. The ground and first floor windows on the rear elevation of the existing house are retained as they were previously (unlike in the original application) to match the front elevation and adjacent properties.

- b) *'they provide a high standard of amenity for future and neighbouring occupiers; including maintaining appropriate distances between buildings and the creation of development-free buffer zones between housing and employment uses incorporating means of screening where necessary;'*

The amenity is of a higher standard than the original proposal for future occupiers, as for example the first-floor head heights are increased. The windows to the south (side) elevation of the property to the Kitchen are now higher level, decreasing the risk of overlooking from the previous proposal, improving the standard of amenity for neighbouring occupiers. Additionally, the removal of the balcony reduces the footprint of the development slightly on the first floor, creating a better development-free buffer zone.

- c) *‘extensions are subservient to the original building, are in keeping with the existing buildings in terms of scale, materials and details and minimise impact on residential amenity of future and neighbouring occupiers;’*

The extension is in keeping with the existing building and adjacent buildings in terms of scale and details and minimising the impact on residential amenity. The extension is not required to be subservient to the original building for the following reasons:

1. Point 1.9 of the SPD states that the ‘guidance and additional details... have been produced on the principle of ‘comply or justify’’ and that *‘Proposals which depart from the guidance set out in this SPD will need to provide a full justification. The council will be flexible where innovative and contemporary designs which enhance the appearance and character of an area are proposed’.*
2. The proposal is felt to comply with the SPD guidance with this exception, which is justified by the fact that the majority of the adjacent houses have extensions which are not subservient and have a ridge height higher than the existing house, as stated in a) 2. above.
3. It is also felt that the design is contemporary and enhances the appearance and character of the area by the fact that it better matches these houses.
4. Compare also previously approved applications such as 2001/62/91520/W2 for 24 The Paddock in which the extension is clearly not subservient to the existing house but was approved.



Figure 01 – Image taken from Google Maps (2025) edited by FBA, indicating the Street Scene of the Paddock and the houses which have an extension with a higher ridge level than the original house.