

**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:	<b>2025/62/92545/W</b>
Site Address:	Stonecourt, Oldfield Road, Honley, Holmfirth, HD9 6NL
Description:	Erection of single and two storey rear extension and associated alterations
Recommending Officer:	Joanna Rednall

**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.**

John Holmes

***AUTHORISED OFFICER***

**Date: 05-Nov-2025**

## **The Site**

Stonecourt is a two-storey detached dwelling situated in Honley, Holmfirth. The property occupies a generous, elevated plot above the highway, featuring landscaped lawns to both the front and rear. A driveway extends along the front and side of the dwelling, providing access to a single detached garage. The house is constructed in natural stone with a blue slate roof and is situated within a row of properties that vary in terms of design and architectural features.

The site is designated as Green Belt on the Kirklees Local Plan map.

## **The Proposal**

The applicant is seeking planning permission for erection of single and two storey rear extension and associated alterations.

The single storey extension projects around 4m from the rear of the dwelling and measures 2.7m in width, with an eave height of around 2.8m. This extension is designed with a cat slide roof adjoining the two-storey rear extension. The two storey element projects 6m from the rear of the dwelling and measures 6.6m in width, 5.6m at eave height and 8m to the ridge.

The extension is finished in natural stone with a blue slate roof with UPVC windows. Internally, the extensions serve a wc, utility, kitchen and dining area at ground floor as well as two bedrooms and an en-suite at first floor level.

One chimney stack would be demolished as part of the proposal.

## **History of Negotiations**

No amendments have been sought in the processing of this application as it was considered significant amendments would be required to overcome the harm of the development.

## **Planning History**

Relevant planning history for this site is summarised as follows:-

94/92594: Erection of detached garage  
Conditional full permission

## **Publicity & Representations**

The Council are currently undertaking the legal statutory publicity requirements, as set out at Table 1 in the Kirklees Development Management Charter. As such, this application has been publicised via a site notice.

Final publicity date expired: 30<sup>th</sup> October 2025.

No representations were received as a result of the publicity.

## **Parish/ Town Council Comments**

Holme Valley Parish Council: Oppose - A planning statement is required for development in greenbelt, the extension is out of scale with the original building and there is a loss of the chimney as a key feature.

**Officer response:** These points are noted. The required plans and information have been submitted for the LPA to progress the application to determination. The proposal's scale and loss of the chimney is noted and is assessed under section 1 (green belt) and section 2 of the 'assessment' section of this report.

### **Consultations**

No statutory consultations were requested for this application.

### **Allocation & Policies**

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).

Local guidance and policy is provided by the Kirklees Local Plan (adopted February 2019) and Holme Valley Neighbourhood Development Plan. The site falls within the Green Belt and Strategic Green Infrastructure Network as identified within the Kirklees Local Plan. The site is also in an area with a known presence of bats, twilight birds and lower risk of land instability as a result of former mining activity.

as such the following policy, guidance and legislation is considered relevant to the determination of this application:-

#### Kirklees Local Plan (LP)

- LP1 Achieving Sustainable Development
- LP2 Place Shaping
- LP21 Highway Safety
- LP22 Parking Provision
- LP24 Design
- LP30 Biodiversity
- LP57 The extension, alteration or replacement of existing buildings

#### Holme Valley Neighbourhood Development Plan

The following policies of this plan are considered most relevant:

- Policy 1 – Protecting and Enhancing the Landscape Character of the 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

#### National Policies and Guidance

National planning policy and guidance is set out in National Policy Statements, primarily the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) published 12<sup>th</sup> December

2024, 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. Considered to be of relevance to the consideration of this application are policies within the following chapters: -

- Chapter 2 – Achieving sustainable development
- Chapter 9 – Promoting sustainable transport
- Chapter 12 – Achieving well-designed places
- Chapter 14 – Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change
- Chapter 16 – Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

#### Supplementary Planning Guidance

House Extensions and Alterations SPD (June 2021)  
Holme Valley Neighbourhood Development Plan

#### Legislation

The Town & Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).

Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 sets out that in considering planning applications the determination must be made in accordance with the plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

#### **Assessment**

##### **1 – Principle of development:**

Policy LP1 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 National Planning Policy Framework. LP1 goes on further to stating that:

*The Council will always work pro-actively with applicants jointly to find solutions which mean that the proposal can be approved wherever possible, and to secure development that improves the economic, social and environmental conditions in the area.*

Policy LP2 sets out that all development proposals should seek to build on the strengths, opportunities and help address challenges identified in the Local Plan. Policy LP24 of the KLP is relevant and states that “good design should be at the core of all proposals in the district”.

#### Land allocation – Green Belt

Land allocation – Green Belt The site is designated Green Belt on the Kirklees Local Plan. The NPPF identifies that the fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open. The NPPF also identifies five purposes of the Green Belt, the most relevant in this case being to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment. Paragraph 153 of the NPPF states that inappropriate development should not be approved except in very special circumstances. Certain forms of development are exceptions to ‘inappropriate

development'. All proposals for development in the Green Belt should be treated as inappropriate unless they fall within one of the exceptions set out in paragraph 154 and 155.

Further to this, Policy LP57 of the Kirklees Local Plan states the following:

*'Proposals for the extension, alteration or replacement of buildings in the Green Belt will normally be acceptable provided that:*

- a. in the case of extensions the original building remains the dominant element both in terms of size and overall appearance. The cumulative impact of previous extensions and of other associated buildings will be taken into account. Proposals to extend buildings which have already been extended should have regard to the scale and character of the original part of the building;*
- b. in the case of replacement buildings, the new building must be in the same use as and not be materially larger than the building it is replacing;*
- c. the proposal does not result in a greater impact on openness in terms of the treatment of outdoor areas, including hard standings, curtilages and enclosures and means of access; and*
- d. the design and materials should have regard to relevant design policies to ensure that the resultant development does not materially detract from its Green Belt setting.'*

Paragraph 154(c) sets out that the extension or alteration of a building provided that it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building may be an acceptable exception.

The application seeks planning permission for the erection of single- and two-storey rear extensions and associated alterations to the existing dwelling. There is relevant planning history relating to the site, specifically the approval for the erection of a detached garage under application reference 94/92594. A review of Council records, historic aerial imagery, and the officer's site visit confirms that this permission has been implemented. The existing detached garage therefore constitutes an enlargement of the original dwellinghouse and must be factored into the assessment of cumulative built form and impact.

Based on officers volume calculations, the original dwellinghouse had an approximate volume of 485.3m<sup>3</sup>. The proposed extensions, when combined with the existing detached garage, would increase the total built volume by approximately 476m<sup>3</sup>, equating to an overall increase of around 98.1% over the original structure. This represents a substantial intensification of development on the site.

It is, however, acknowledged that the assessment of whether an extension constitutes a "disproportionate addition" within the meaning of paragraph 154(c) of the NPPF is not solely a numerical or volumetric exercise. Consideration must also be given to the visual and spatial relationship between the proposed development and the original dwelling, having regard to scale, siting, massing, and overall design.

In this instance, it is considered that the proposed single- and two-storey rear extensions, by virtue of their overall size, height, and bulk, would form a visually dominant and discordant addition to the host property. The cumulative massing of the extensions would compete visually with the original dwelling, resulting in a form of development that would fail to appear subservient. The proposal would therefore erode the legibility of the original house as the principal element of the building.

Furthermore, given the property's siting and topography, the extensions would be readily visible from public vantage points, thereby increasing their perceived impact on the openness of the surrounding Green Belt.

When viewed cumulatively with the existing detached garage, the proposal would materially increase the overall scale and footprint of built development on the site. This additional massing would further compound the visual and spatial impact, resulting in a level of development that is considered disproportionate relative to the size and character of the original dwelling. As such, the proposal would not fall within the exception set out under paragraph 154(c) of the NPPF, which permits extensions to buildings in the Green Belt provided they are not disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building.

Accordingly, the proposal constitutes inappropriate development within the Green Belt, for which no very special circumstances have been advanced or are considered to exist that would outweigh the identified harm. The harm arises from both the inappropriateness of the development itself and the resulting reduction in the openness of the Green Belt, contrary to the fundamental aim of the Green Belt.

For these reasons, it is concluded that the proposal would amount to a disproportionate addition to the original dwellinghouse, contrary to paragraph 154(c) of the NPPF and Policy LP57(a) of the Local Plan. The development would therefore represent inappropriate development within the Green Belt, resulting in harm to its openness and failing to preserve its character and function.

## **2 – Impact upon visual amenity**

Policy LP24 (Design) of the Council's adopted Local Plan sets out that proposals should promote good design by ensuring the form, scale, layout and details of all development respects and enhances the character of the townscape, 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. Paragraph 135 of the NPPF is also of relevance to the consideration of this application.

Key Design Principles 1 and 2 of the Council's adopted House Extensions & Alterations Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) seek to ensure development is subservient to the host property and in keeping with the character of the locality. Principle 7 of the House Extensions SPD requires development to ensure an appropriately sized and useable area of private outdoor space is retained.

Policy 1 of the Holme Valley Neighbourhood Plan HVNP sets out that development proposal should demonstrate how they have been informed by the key characteristics of the Local Character Assessment (LCA).

Policy 2 of the HVNP states that new development should protect and enhance local built character and distinctiveness, strengthen the local sense of place by respecting the existing grain of development in the surrounding area, use local materials and detailing which add to the quality or character of the surrounding environment, respect the scale, mass, height and form of existing buildings in the locality and their setting. Furthermore this policy sets out that development should sit in with and neither dominate or have a detrimental; impact on its surroundings and neighbouring properties.

The application site is within Landscape Character Area 5 - Netherthong Rural Fringe

Key landscape characteristic of the area are:

- The elevation offers extensive views of the surrounding landscape with long distance views towards Castle Hill and Huddersfield and the valley sides afford framed views towards settlements in the valley below.
- Within Netherthong and Oldfield views of the surrounding landscape are often glimpsed between buildings.
- Distinctive stone wall field boundary treatments divide the agricultural landscape.
- Public Rights of Way (PRoW), including the Holme Valley Circular Walk, cross the landscape providing links between settlements. National Cycle Route no. 68 also crosses the area.

The following Key Characteristics also apply to Holmfirth.

- The town centre is defined by its prominent Georgian church and mid-Victorian buildings.
- The Picturedrome, Civic Hall, Masonic Lodge and the former Holmfirth Technical college reflect local history and provide focal points in the streetscene.
- Mid-19th century terraces constructed largely of millstone grit with slate roofs form the predominant residential building style and often feature ornamental iron railings.
- Built form is generally aligned to the back of the pavement giving a strongly defined building line and distinctive layout.

Key built characteristic of the area are

- In Netherthong and Oldfield buildings are grouped around courtyards to provide protection from the elements whilst Deanhouse has a predominantly linear plan.
- Vernacular buildings largely comprise farmhouses, barns and two and three storey weaver's cottages of millstone grit with stone mullioned windows.

The applicant is seeking planning permission for erection of single and two storey rear extension and associated alterations. The single storey extension projects around 4m from the rear of the dwelling and measures 2.7m in width, with an eave height of around 2.8m. This extension is designed with a cat slide roof adjoining the two-storey rear extension, of which projects around 6m from the rear of the dwelling and measures 6.6m in width, 5.6m at eave height and 8m to the ridge.

The extension is finished in natural stone with a blue slate roof with UPVC windows. One chimney stack would be demolished as part of the proposal.

As set out in Section 1 of this report, the proposed development would constitute a disproportionate addition to the original dwellinghouse. The resulting increase in built form would significantly exceed what could reasonably be considered a limited extension within the meaning of paragraph 154(c) of the NPPF and Policy LP57(a) of the Kirklees Local Plan. Accordingly, the development would represent inappropriate development within the Green Belt, causing harm to its openness and conflicting with its fundamental aim of maintaining openness.

In addition to the policy conflict identified above, the scale, bulk, and design of the proposed extensions would result in a form of development that appears visually disproportionate and unsympathetic to the proportions of the original dwelling. The extensions, by reason of their size, height, and overall massing, would not read as subordinate additions but rather as competing elements that visually dominate the host building. This lack of subservience conflicts with Key Design Principle 2 of the Council's House Extensions and Alterations SPD, which requires extensions to remain clearly subordinate in scale and form to the original dwelling to ensure visual harmony and coherence.

Consequently, the proposal would fail to respect the established character and appearance of the host property and its surroundings, contrary to Policy LP24 (a and c) of the Local Plan, which seeks to ensure that development proposals are well-designed, respect the character of both the townscape and landscape, and that extensions remain subservient to the original building.

The submitted details confirm that the proposed extension would be constructed using natural stone for the external walls and a blue slate roof to match the materials of the existing dwelling. The plans also indicated that mullioned windows and other traditional detailing would be incorporated to reflect the architectural character and form of the original property. These measures are welcomed in principle, as they would ensure a degree of consistency between the extension and the host dwelling.

However, while the use of matching materials and design detailing would contribute positively to the overall appearance of the scheme, such measures do not mitigate or outweigh the fundamental harm identified in relation to the impact on the Green Belt. As a result, it would form an unduly prominent and non-subservient addition, which would diminish the openness of the Green Belt and cause harm to the visual amenity of both the dwelling and its surroundings.

The proposal also includes the demolition of one of the existing chimney stacks, with the submitted plans confirming that the materials would be reused in the construction of the proposed extension. The chimney to be removed is the secondary stack, positioned further to the rear of the dwelling. Given its location and limited prominence, its demolition is considered to have only a minor impact on the character of the original house.

It is therefore considered that in terms of visual amenity, the proposed would be contrary with Policy LP24 of the Kirklees Local Plan, the adopted House Extensions and Alterations SPD, and advice within the National Planning Policy Framework.

### **3 – Impact on residential amenity:**

Policy LP24 of the Kirklees Local Plan and Chapter 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework seeks to ensure development has an acceptable impact upon the amenity of neighbouring occupiers. Key Design Principles 3, 4, 5 and 6 of the Council's adopted House Extensions & Alterations SPD seek to ensure development does not have a detrimental impact upon privacy of neighbouring occupiers, cause unacceptable levels of overshadowing or be unacceptably oppressive / overbearing.

Policy 2 of the HVNP sets out that proposals should be designed to minimise harmful impacts on general amenity for present and future occupiers of land and buildings and prevent or reduce pollution as a result of noise, odour, light and other causes. Light pollution should be minimised and security lighting must be appropriate, unobtrusive and energy efficient.

The House Extensions and Alterations SPD sets out a number of design principles which will need to be considered when assessing a proposal's impact on residential amenity, which state:

- Principle 3 – that: *“extensions and alterations should be designed to achieve reasonable levels of privacy for both inhabitants, future occupants, and neighbours”.*
- Principle 4 – that: *“extensions and alterations should consider the design and layout of habitable and non-habitable rooms to reduce conflict between neighbouring properties relating to privacy, light and outlook.”*
- Principle 5 – that: *“extensions and alterations should not adversely affect the amount of natural light presently enjoyed by a neighbouring property”.*
- Principle 6 – that: *“extensions and alterations should not unduly reduce the outlook from a neighbouring property.”*

With regard to privacy, the submitted plans indicate the introduction of new openings on the north-west and south-east facing elevations. The north-west elevation would include a first-floor window, while the south-east elevation would contain a ground-floor window; both are proposed to be obscurely glazed. Given the use of obscure glazing and the nature of these openings, it is considered that the proposal would not result in any unacceptable overlooking or loss of privacy for the occupiers of neighbouring dwellings.

In terms of potential overshadowing and overbearing effects, the proposal would introduce additional bulk and massing towards the common boundaries with Hagg Leys to the south-east and Brackenside to the north-west. The single-storey element of the extension would be positioned approximately 7 metres from the shared boundary with Hagg Leys and around 12 metres from the side elevation of that neighbouring dwelling. The two-storey element would maintain a minimum separation distance of approximately 5 metres to the side elevation of Brackenside, increasing slightly further into the extension due to the angled orientation of the host property, Stonecourt. Having regard to these separation distances, the relative positioning of the dwellings, and the presence of established boundary vegetation, including mature trees and hedgerows, it is considered that the proposal would not result in any significant overshadowing, loss of light, or overbearing impacts to the occupiers of neighbouring properties. The scale and siting of the proposed extensions are such that they would not materially harm the outlook or living conditions of adjacent properties.

It is therefore considered that in terms of residential amenity, the proposed would comply with Policy LP24 of the Kirklees Local Plan, Principles 3, 4, 5 and 6 of the adopted House Extensions and Alterations SPD, and advice within Chapter 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

#### **4 – Impact on highway safety:**

Policies LP21 and LP22 of the Kirklees Local Plan and policies within chapter 9 of the NPPF relate to access and highway safety and are considered to be relevant to the consideration of this application. The Council's adopted Highway Design Guide and Key Design Principle 15 of the adopted House Extensions & Alterations SPD which seek to ensure acceptable levels of off street parking are retained are also considered to be of relevance.

The proposed development would increase the number of bedrooms within the dwelling from three to four. In accordance with the Council's SPD, dwellings with four or more bedrooms are expected to provide a minimum of three off-street parking spaces. Although the existing detached garage would be removed, the property benefits from a spacious driveway to the front and side, which would remain unaffected by the proposed extension. It is considered that this area provides adequate capacity to accommodate the parking requirements associated with the additional bedroom. As such, the proposal is regarded as having an acceptable impact on parking provision and highway safety.

The proposal does not propose any changes highway access. It is therefore considered that the proposal is acceptable in relation to highway safety.

It is also noted that there is sufficient space within the site boundary to accommodate bin storage and therefore would comply with Key Design Principle 16 of the SPD.

It is therefore considered that in terms of access and highway safety / parking the proposed would comply with Policies LP21 and LP22 of the Kirklees Local Plan, principle 15 of the Council's Street Design Guide and chapter 9 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

## **5 – Other matters:**

### *Ecology*

Policy 13 (Protecting Wildlife and Securing Biodiversity Net Gain) of the Home Valley Neighbourhood Plan sets out that development proposals should demonstrate how biodiversity will be protected and enhanced including the local wildlife, ecological networks, designated Local Wildlife Sites and habitats.

Chapter 15 of the National Planning Policy Framework are relevant, together with The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 which protect, by law, the habitat and animals of certain species including newts, bats and badgers.

Policy LP30 of the Kirklees Local Plan requires that proposals protect Habitats and Species of Principal Importance. Whilst it is acknowledged that the site is located within an identified bat alert area, the proposals are to a dwelling with rooms in the roof space and therefore it is considered unlikely that the proposals would have an impact on the bat population as it is considered there is a low likelihood of roosting bats within the roof. Notwithstanding this point, an informative is recommended, making the applicant aware that if bats are discovered on site during the works, any development shall cease and the applicant is advised to contact Natural England for advice on how to move forward.

### *Climate Change*

On 12<sup>th</sup> 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 pre-dates 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.

Considering the modest nature of the proposed development, it is considered that the proposed development would not have an impact on climate change that needs mitigation to address the climate change emergency. A Climate Change statement has been submitted with this application.

## **6 – Representations:**

The representation received from the parish council is detailed and addressed in earlier sections of this report.

## **7 – 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 not constitute sustainable development and is therefore recommended for refusal.

**Recommendation**

**REFUSE**

## **Decision Authorisation - Delegated Powers**

**Application Number:** 2025/92545

**Officer Recommendation:** Refuse.

## **Reason:**

The proposed development, by virtue of its design and scale, constitutes a disproportionate addition to Stonecourt, Oldfield Road. In addition the proposed development represents a visually harmful development that does not harmonise with the host property and wider locality. The development therefore constitutes inappropriate development within the Green Belt for which no very special circumstances have been submitted to outweigh the harm to the Green Belt which also has a detrimental visual impact. The proposal fails to accord with policies LP24 & LP57 of the Kirklees Local Plan, Policy 2 of the Holme Valley Neighbourhood Development Plan and policies within Chapters 12 and 13 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Plans and specifications schedule:-

<b>Plan Type</b>	<b>Reference</b>	<b>Version</b>	<b>Date Received</b>
Location Plan	25/1159/01a	-	16/09/2025
Existing Block Plan	25/1159/02a	-	16/09/2025
General Arrangement as Existing	25/1159/03b	-	16/09/2025

<b>Plan Type</b>	<b>Reference</b>	<b>Version</b>	<b>Date Received</b>
Proposed Block Plan	25/1159/05c	-	16/09/2025
General Arrangement as Proposed	25/1159/04c	-	16/09/2025
Application form	-	-	16/09/2025
Climate change statement	-	-	16/09/2025

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 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. No amendments have been sought in the processing of this application as it was considered significant amendments would be required to overcome the harm of the development.

Low coal