

**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:	2025/62/91096/W
Site Address:	7, Edgerton Green, Edgerton, Huddersfield, HD1 5RD
Description:	Raising of eaves and ridge height, 1.no dormer to rear and 2.no dormers to front, first floor extension to front, single storey extension to front, two storey extension to north eastern (side) elevation, part first floor and two storey extension to south western elevation and single storey extension to rear including associated works
Recommending Officer:	Jennifer Booth

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: 01-Jul-2025

OFFICER REPORT

Site Description

7 Edgerton Green is a detached two storey property located in Edgerton, Huddersfield. The property benefits from a large front garden and driveway with an attached double garage to the side and modest rear garden. The property benefits from a side extension and rear extension with an above balcony. The main roof is gabled with the garage and extension having a flat roof. The property is constructed in buff brick on the sides and white cladding to the front, with brick used for the garage and existing extension. The front of the property benefits from an overhang from the property, along near all of the length of the property.

The site is located on a residential area, with the properties sharing a similar design and style although with numerous alterations changing this. The properties in this area were built in the late 1960s, with many properties having had various extensions and alterations since then. However, there is a predominant style of detached properties with gabled roof forms constructed in numerous renders and brick, with front dormers not being uncommon.

Description of Proposal

The applicant is seeking permission for raising of eaves and ridge height, 1.no dormer to rear and 2.no dormers to front, first floor extension to front, single storey extension to front, two storey extension to north eastern (side) elevation, part first floor and two storey extension to south western elevation and single storey extension to rear including associated works.

The proposals include increasing the eaves height from 5.1m to 5.5m and increasing the overall height from 8.1m to 8.7m. walls would be rendered.

The front porch would have a projection of 1.6m and a width of 3.9m with a lean to roof form.

The first floor front extension would project 3.5m with a width of 5.8m over the existing garages. The roof form would be a perpendicular pitched roof form.

The plans include two dormers within the front roof plane each with a width of 2.5m and an overall height of 1.8m with pitched roof forms.

The scheme includes single and two storey extensions to the sides and rear which result in an overall depth of the main house of 11.9m on the ground floor reducing to 10.9m and width of 16.5m. the roof over the main house would be pitched with a lean to over the ground floor element. The walls would be constructed using blockwork and render with tiles for the roof covering.

The rear dormer would have a width of 15m and a height of 3m with horizontal boarding.

Relevant Planning History

2015/91288 – erection of extensions and formation of living space in garage – approved although not built

2018/93156 – erection of front porch - approved

History of negotiations

Kirklees Development Management Charter together with the National Planning Policy Framework and the DMPO 2024 encourages negotiation/engagement between Local Planning Authorities and agents/applicants, this is only within the scope of the application under consideration. The scale of the proposed extension, including the increased height, bulk, massing, and design of the rear dormer, would not constitute subservient additions and would appear out of keeping with the character of the host property and the surrounding street scene. Furthermore, no information has been supplied regarding the protected trees to the rear of the site. Amended plans & additional information has not been sought.

Representations

The application was advertised by site notice, which expired on 30/05/2025

As a result of the above publicity, no representations have been 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 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
- **LP 30** – Biodiversity
- **LP 33** – Trees
- **LP 35** - Historic Environment

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. As such, it is anticipated that this SPD will assist with ensuring enhanced consistency in both approach and outcomes relating to house extensions.

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 places
- Chapter 14 – Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change
- Chapter 15 – Conserving and enhancing the natural environment
- Chapter 16 – Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

Assessment

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 & 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.

The rear boundary of the dwelling is the boundary of the neighbouring Edgerton Conservation Area and as such there will need to be consideration in terms of the relationship formed between the proposals and the Conservation Area with regards to policy LP35 of the Kirklees Local Plan and chapter 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework. It is also noted that the property backs onto the grounds of the Ukrainian Centre which is a listed building.

Heritage considerations:

The application site backs onto the Edgerton Conservation Area and the grounds of the Ukrainian Centre, which is a Grade II listed building. Notwithstanding this proximity, a substantial and continuous belt of mature trees lies between the rear boundary of the property and the adjoining land, providing a strong visual and physical buffer. This tree coverage plays a key role in preserving the visual distinction between Edgerton Green and the designated heritage assets to the rear. As a result, the proposed development would not be visible from, or have any discernible impact on, the setting or significance of either the Edgerton Conservation Area or the listed Ukrainian Centre.

In view of the above, it is considered that the proposed works would preserve the character and setting of nearby heritage assets, and as such, the development is deemed to be acceptable when assessed against the requirements of Policy LP35 of the Kirklees Local Plan and the provisions of Chapter 16 (Conserving and enhancing the historic environment) of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

Impact on visual amenity:

Key Design Principle 1 of the House Extensions & Alterations SPD does state 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. Furthermore, Key Design Principle 2 of the House Extensions & Alterations SPD goes onto state that extensions should not dominate or be

larger than the original house and should be in keeping with the existing building in terms of scale, materials and details.

The proposal under consideration consists of six distinct elements which shall be addressed below.

Front porch

Paragraph 5.13 of the House Extensions & Alterations SPD states that front extensions are highly prominent in the street scene. As per paragraph 5.14 of the House Extensions & Alterations SPD, careful consideration needs to be given to ensure that they are carefully designed to limit the potential for them to erode the character, they should be small and subservient to the main house and constructed using appropriate materials.

The front porch would be modest in terms of its size and would be constructed using matching materials with render for the walling and tiles for the roof covering. The porch is therefore considered to be acceptable in terms of visual amenity.

First floor front extension

Paragraph 5.13 of the House Extensions & Alterations SPD states that front extensions are highly prominent in the street scene. As per paragraph 5.14 of the House Extensions & Alterations SPD, careful consideration needs to be given to ensure that they are carefully designed to limit the potential for them to erode the character, they should be small and subservient to the main house and constructed using appropriate materials.

The first floor front extension over the garage would follow the footprint of the existing garage. Whilst the extension is sizeable, it would form an appropriate relationship with the host property. The use of a road facing gable would mimic other properties in the street scene. The materials proposed include the use of render for the walling with tiles for the roof covering which would match the overall alterations to the main house. The first floor front extension is considered to be acceptable in terms of visual amenity.

Increase in height

Raising the height of a dwelling would typically be considered a significant form of roof extension and, unless very carefully designed in accordance with the local character and with minimal visual intrusion, could conflict with Section 5.4 of the SPD. Such a proposal would likely be resisted where it results in a disproportionate or unsympathetic addition, particularly if it contributes to a top-heavy or incongruous appearance when viewed from the street.

The proposed development would result in an increase in the overall height of the dwelling from approximately 8.1 metres to 8.7 metres. The application site is located on a street characterised by a consistent and uniform ridge height

across neighbouring properties, which contributes to a coherent and balanced street scene. The proposed increase in height, when considered alongside the enlarged footprint and additional massing, would result in a development that appears disproportionate and visually dominant in relation to both the host dwelling and surrounding properties. Consequently, the proposal would fail to appear subservient and would be out of keeping with the established character of the street, contrary to the design principles of Kirklees Design Principles KDP 1 and KDP 2 as set out in the House Extensions & Alterations SPD.

Front dormers

Paragraph 5.26 of the House Extensions & Alterations SPD requires consideration of the wider area and surrounding buildings when considering whether a front dormer is appropriate. Dormers should be well-designed and small in scale.

The front dormers would both be modest in terms of their size and appropriate in terms of the materials. In isolation, front dormers could potentially be supported providing they do not rely on the increase in the height of the dwelling.

Exterior alterations

Paragraph 4.2 of the House Extensions & Alterations SPD states that “the local context, character and identity of the area will be a significant factor in determining the appropriate form and scale of alterations”. Paragraph 4.6 states “where extensions seek to **differ from the existing materials**, design, roof pitch or detailing, proposals will be considered on a case by case basis.”

Whilst the scheme includes the use of render for all elevations, removing the existing brick detailing, this would be similar to other properties in the street and as such would be considered to be acceptable in terms of visual amenity.

Single & two storey extensions to the side and rear

As this proposal is for a side and rear extension, the following paragraphs of the House Extensions & Alterations SPD are of relevance. Paragraphs 5.15 & 5.17 of the House Extensions & Alterations SPD with regards to the side extension as they require the development proposed to be located and designed to minimise the impact on the character of the area, reflect the original building in terms of materials and detailing and ensure adequate space is retained to provide a sense of space. Paragraphs 5.1, 5.2 & 5.6 of the House Extensions & Alterations SPD go into further specific detail regarding rear extensions requiring development to maintain the quality of the residential environment, respect the original house and use appropriate materials.

The proposed development comprises a combination of single and two-storey extensions to both the sides and rear of the existing dwelling. Collectively,

these additions would result in a significantly enlarged built form, producing a broadly rectangular footprint. While the overall footprint in isolation may be considered proportionate to the plot size, the cumulative scale, bulk, and massing of the extensions would substantially alter the character and appearance of the dwelling.

The resultant built form would appear overly dominant and visually discordant in relation to the original dwellinghouse. The proposed extensions fail to achieve a subservient form and would detract from the architectural integrity of the host property. Moreover, the scale of the additions, particularly at two storeys, would not respect the established character or rhythm of development within the street scene.

Although the use of materials may reflect those of the existing dwelling, this alone is not sufficient to mitigate the adverse impact arising from the scale and design of the proposed extensions. Overall, the development would not represent an acceptable form of alteration and would be contrary to established design principles intended to protect the visual amenities of both the host property and the surrounding area.

Rear dormer

In point 5.25 of the House Extensions & Alterations SPD, it does suggest that rear dormers can be considered to be appropriate dependent upon design and size.

The SPD encourages dormers to be subordinate additions that do not dominate the roofscape and are designed to respect the character of the existing dwelling and its surroundings.

In this instance, the proposed rear dormer is of a considerable scale and massing. When assessed in the context of the existing roof form and the other extensions proposed as part of the wider scheme, the cumulative impact of the roof alterations would result in a substantial enlargement of the dwelling's overall bulk. The dormer would fail to appear as a subservient addition and would instead dominate the rear roof plane, resulting in a top-heavy and disproportionate appearance.

The size and design of the dormer, when viewed alongside the other proposed extensions, would exacerbate the visual impact on the host dwelling and contribute to an overall incongruous built form. This would be harmful not only to the architectural integrity of the existing property but also to the visual amenity of the surrounding area and street scene.

For these reasons, the rear dormer is considered to conflict with the guidance outlined in the SPD and is not acceptable in terms of visual amenity.

Having taken the above into account, the proposed upward extensions, by reason of their scale, height and design, would result in a visually incongruous addition that fails to appear subservient to the original dwelling. The

extensions would disrupt the architectural proportions of the host property and appear as an overly dominant feature that does not respect the character or form of the existing building. As such, the proposal is considered to be contrary to Policy LP24(a) of the Kirklees Local Plan, which requires development to respect the form, scale and layout of the original building, and Policy LP24(c), which requires extensions to be subservient and in keeping with the host property. Furthermore, the development conflicts with Key Design Principles 1 and 2 of the Council's House Extensions and Alterations SPD, which seek to ensure that extensions are proportionate and do not dominate the existing dwelling. The proposal also fails to accord with the aims of Chapter 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework, which promotes high-quality design that is sympathetic to local character.

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 Extensions & 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.

There are no properties directly to the rear which could be affected by the works proposed.

Impact on 6 Edgerton Green

The proposed increase in both the footprint and height of the host dwelling would result in a materially larger built form positioned approximately 1.2m from the shared boundary with the adjacent property to the south-west, and approximately 6m from the neighbouring dwelling itself. The host property is broadly aligned with the rear garden area of the neighbouring property, and land levels appear to be similar, resulting in a direct and open relationship between the two plots.

Given the proximity of the proposed extension to the boundary and its increased height and massing, some degree of visual change would be perceptible from the neighbouring garden and ground floor rear-facing windows. However, the separation between the two dwellings provides a reasonable buffer that significantly reduces any sense of enclosure or undue dominance. In addition, the presence of the existing dwelling already establishes a built form along this part of the boundary, which helps to mitigate the overall impact of the proposed extension.

The lack of windows in the proposed side elevation further ensures that there would be no material loss of privacy, and the degree of overshadowing is unlikely to be significant given the orientation and spacing between the properties. While the extension would increase the visual presence of built

form near the boundary, the overall impact on the neighbouring property's private outdoor space is not considered to be unacceptably overbearing in the context of the existing arrangement and separation.

With regards to the impact on the adjacent 6 Edgerton Green, the scheme has been considered in terms of KDP3 – privacy, KDP5 – overshadowing and KDP 6 – overbearing impact of the House Extensions & Alterations SPD, policy LP24 of the KLP c) in term of minimising impact on neighbouring occupiers and advice within chapter 12 of the NPPF and the proposals are considered to be acceptable.

Impact on 8 Edgerton Green

The proposed increase in the footprint and height of the host dwelling would position the extended built form approximately 1.2m from the shared boundary and around 6m from the neighbouring dwelling to the north-east. The host property is aligned with the front garden of the adjacent property, and land levels appear to be similar, providing a broadly even relationship between the two sites.

Given the intervening distance between the two dwellings and the fact that the extension would be located opposite the front garden of the neighbouring property rather than more sensitive private amenity space to the rear, the impact in terms of overbearing and enclosure is considered to be limited. Furthermore, the existing form of the host dwelling already establishes a visual presence along this part of the boundary, which would help to mitigate the perceived effect of the additional built form.

While the development would introduce a degree of visual change when viewed from the neighbouring garden and frontage, the separation between the properties, combined with the orientation and existing relationship, would prevent the extension from appearing unduly dominant or oppressive.

The proposed extension includes several openings within the side elevation facing No. 8, most of which replicate existing window positions and therefore do not introduce new opportunities for overlooking. This elevation faces the front garden of No. 8, which is not afforded the same level of privacy as rear amenity space.

As part of the internal reconfiguration, the removal of the front-facing window to Bedroom 4 and its replacement with a side-facing window is not considered to result in any material loss of privacy, given its outlook towards the less sensitive front garden area. Overall, the proposal is considered to have a neutral impact on privacy in relation to No. 8.

As such, the proposal is not considered to result in a harmful impact on the residential amenity of the neighbouring occupiers to the north-east.

With regards to the impact on the adjacent 8 Edgerton Green, the scheme has been considered in terms of KDP3 – privacy, KDP5 – overshadowing and

KDP 6 – overbearing impact of the House Extensions & Alterations SPD, policy LP24 of the KLP c) in term of minimising impact on neighbouring occupiers and advice within chapter 12 of the NPPF and the proposals are considered to be acceptable.

Impact on 10 & 11 Edgerton Green

The properties located on the opposite side of the road, Nos. 10 and 11 Edgerton Green, are situated approximately 23 to 30 metres from the application site. Given this substantial separation distance, along with the intervening public highway and front garden areas, it is not considered that the proposed development would result in any material harm to the residential amenity of these properties. There would be no adverse impact in terms of overlooking, overshadowing, or overbearing, and the relationship between the dwellings would remain acceptable.

With regards to the impact on the neighbouring 10 & 11 Edgerton Green, the scheme has been considered in terms of KDP3 – privacy, KDP5 – overshadowing and KDP 6 – overbearing impact of the House Extensions & Alterations SPD, policy LP24 of the KLP c) in term of minimising impact on neighbouring occupiers and advice within chapter 12 of the NPPF and the proposals are considered to be acceptable.

Having considered the above factors, the proposals are not considered to result in any adverse impact upon the residential amenity of any surrounding neighbouring occupants, complying with Policy LP24 of the Kirklees Local Plan (b) in terms of the amenities of neighbouring properties, Key Design Principles 3, 5, 6 & 7 of the House Extensions & Alterations SPD and Chapter 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Impact on highway safety:

The proposals will result in some intensification of the domestic use and the reduction in usable space within the integral, double garage. It is noted that the current garages are not of a sufficient size to constitute parking against modern standard. Furthermore, the property has parking to the front for at least three vehicles which is considered to represent a sufficient provision. Bin storage for the dwelling would not be moved as part of the proposals. As such the scheme would not represent any additional harm in terms of highway safety and as such complies with Policy LP22 of the Kirklees Local Plan along with Key Design Principles 15 & 16 of the House Extensions & Alterations SPD.

Other matters:

Biodiversity

After a visual assessment of the building by the officer, it appears that the building is in good order, well-sealed and unlikely to have any significant bat roost potential. Even so, a cautionary note should be added that if bats are

found during the development, then work must cease immediately, and the advice of a licensed bat worker sought.

Trees

The application site is in proximity to trees which are protected and/or contribute to the character of the area. Paragraph 131 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) recognises the important contribution trees make to the quality of urban environments and encourages their retention wherever possible. In line with Policy LP33 of the Kirklees Local Plan, proposals should protect valuable trees and ensure that any potential impacts are fully assessed and appropriately mitigated.

The proposed development would be sited in close proximity to a ribbon of protected trees located along the rear boundary of the site. These trees are subject to a Tree Preservation Order and contribute positively to the character and amenity of the area. However, no arboricultural information has been submitted to demonstrate how potential impacts on these trees would be mitigated. In the absence of an Arboricultural Impact Assessment or any supporting evidence, it has not been demonstrated that the development could be undertaken without causing harm to the health, stability, or long-term retention of the protected trees. The proposal therefore fails to comply with Policy LP33 of the Kirklees Local Plan and the aims of Chapter 15 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Carbon Budget

The proposal is a small scale domestic development to an existing dwelling. 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.

There are no other matters for consideration.

Representations:

None

Negotiations:

None

Proposed conditions

None as the recommendation is for refusal.

Conclusion:

This application for extensions and alterations include raising the roof and front and rear dormers at 7 Edgerton Green has been assessed against relevant policies in the development plan as listed in the policy section of the report, the House Extensions & Alterations SPD, the National Planning Policy Framework and other material considerations.

The proposed development, including an increase in ridge height and a combination of single- and two-storey side and rear extensions, would result in a significantly enlarged and visually dominant dwelling. The cumulative scale, bulk and massing would appear disproportionate to the host property and out of keeping with the uniform character and ridge line of the surrounding street scene. The rear dormer, by reason of its scale and siting, would further contribute to a top-heavy and incongruous form of development, failing to appear subservient to the original dwelling. Although matching materials are proposed, this does not mitigate the overall harm caused to the character and appearance of the dwelling and wider area. To permit the proposals would be contrary to Policy LP24 of the Kirklees Local Plan, KDP1 & KDP2 of the House Extensions & Alterations SPD and Chapter 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

The proposed development, by reason of its proximity to a group of protected trees along the rear boundary, fails to demonstrate that it would not result in harm to their health, stability, or long-term retention. In the absence of any arboricultural assessment or mitigation measures, the proposal is contrary to Policy LP33 of the Kirklees Local Plan and the aims of Chapter 15 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

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. For the reasons set out above it is considered that the development would not constitute sustainable development and is therefore recommended for refusal.

Recommendation

Refuse

Decision Authorisation - Delegated Powers

Application Number: 2025/91096

Officer Recommendation: Refuse

Reasons for refusal

1. The proposed development, due to the increase in ridge height along with the single- and two-storey side and rear extensions, would result in a significantly enlarged and visually dominant dwelling detracting from the street scene and character of the area. To permit the proposals would be contrary to Policy LP24 of the Kirklees Local Plan, KDP1 & KDP2 of the House Extensions & Alterations SPD and Chapter 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework.
2. The cumulative scale, bulk and massing of the extensions proposed would appear disproportionate to the host property and out of keeping with the uniform character and ridge line of the surrounding street scene. The rear dormer, by reason of its scale and siting, would further contribute to a top-heavy and incongruous form of development, failing to appear subservient to the original dwelling. To permit the proposals would be contrary to Policy LP24 of the Kirklees Local Plan, KDP1 & KDP2 of the House Extensions & Alterations SPD and Chapter 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework.
3. The proposed development, by reason of its proximity to a group of protected trees along the rear boundary, fails to demonstrate that it would not result in harm to their health, stability, or long-term retention. In the absence of any arboricultural assessment or mitigation measures, the proposal is contrary to Policy LP33 of the Kirklees Local Plan and the aims of Chapter 15 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Plans and specifications schedule: -

Plan Type	Reference	Web ID	Date Received
Location plan	-	1086553	06/05/2025
Existing plans	PAD.220.150	1086547	06/05/2025
Proposed plans	PAD.220.151	1086554	06/05/2025
Design & access statement	-	1086552	06/05/2025
Climate change statement	-	1086546	06/05/2025

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 Planning Authority have, where possible, made a pre-application advice service available, complied with the Kirklees Development Management Charter 2024 and otherwise actively engaged with the applicant in dealing with the application.

The scale of the proposed extension, including the increased height, bulk, massing, and design of the rear dormer, would not constitute subservient

additions and would appear out of keeping with the character of the host property and the surrounding street scene. Furthermore, no information has been supplied regarding the protected trees to the rear of the site. Amended plans & additional information has not been sought.

Report Dated

30/06/2025