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:	**2025/62/93313/E**
Site Address:	68, Oxford Road, Dewsbury, WF13 4EH
Description:	Erection of two storey front extensions with balcony, two storey rear extension, single storey side extension and balcony to rear roof slope with associated alterations
Recommending Officer:	Nicole Helliwell

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.

Sarah Longbottom

AUTHORISED OFFICER

Date: 20-Jul-2026

Officer Report

Reference No. 2025/62/93313/E

Site Address: 68, Oxford Road, Dewsbury, WF13 4EH

Proposal: Erection of two storey front extension with balcony, two storey rear extension, single storey side extension and balcony to rear roof slope with associated alterations.

Site Description

The application relates to 68 Oxford Road, a two-storey detached property situated in Dewsbury. The dwelling is faced in stone and incorporates a hipped roof finished in tiles. The neighbouring properties are of residential use and are highly varied in age, size, style, and materials. The site is not within a conservation area, nor are there any listed buildings or Public Rights of Way (PROW) within close proximity to the site.

Description of Proposal

The application seeks planning permission for the erection of two storey front extension with a balcony, a two storey rear extension, a single storey side extension and a balcony to rear roof slope with associated alterations. The proposed works are summarised below:

- Two storey rear extension (projection approx. 4m, overall height approx. 7.5m and eaves height approx. 5.5m)
- Single storey side extension (projection approx. 3.6m, maximum height approx. 4.2m, and eaves height approx. 2.22m - 2.75m due to changes in ground level)
- Two storey front extension (projection approx. 2.4m, overall height approx. 8.2m and eaves height approx. 5.5m to 5.7m due to changes in ground level)
- Front canopy (projection approx. 1.4m and overall height approx. 2.9m)
- Installation of Velux windows within the south facing roof plane
- Alterations to the roof height (approx. 0.4m increase)

- Alterations to fenestration within the eastern and western elevations of the dwelling
- Rear dormer extension (width approx. 5.05m, depth approx. 3.25m and overall height approx. 2.42m)
- Installation of balcony/terrace within the south-facing roof plane

Relevant Planning History

- **2007/92842:** Erection of first floor extension to existing bungalow to form two storey dwelling. Planning application details | Kirklees Council – Conditional Full Permission
- **2007/91716:** Erection of first floor extension to existing bungalow to form two storey dwelling. Planning application details | Kirklees Council – Refused

Representations

The application was publicised by site notice, which expired on 9th January 2026. As a result of the above publicity, 16 representations have been received. The comments made have been summarised below:

Supporting Comments (1 Representation)

- I live at the bungalow (No.70) next door, and I fully support this development.
- I have looked at the plans and information submitted and feel that this is an excellent development that will improve the house and uplift the neighbourhood.
- The development will not affect me in any way. A large amount of space will be left between my boundary and the neighbours boundary.
- There are large properties in the area, and I do not have an issue with another well-designed property next to me.
- The larger extension is at the back of the house.
- The front extension looks a quality design.
- Overall, the extensions will be proportionate to the plot size and area. I fully support the extensions and positive changes being made as they will enhance the area in a positive manner and won't be harmful to any of the neighbours.
- Larger properties are needed in the Dewsbury area for its residents, and I welcome such applications which have used planning guidance and the Councils policies in the correct manner.

Objections (14 Representations)

Visual Amenity

- The dwelling is wholly unsympathetic to the character and appearance of the immediately adjacent properties and the wider residential area.
- The proposed bay window and entrance canopy to the front elevation would project beyond the established building line on Oxford Road.

- The houses on the north side of Oxford Road and the south side of Reservoir Street were constructed in the late 1950s as modest single storey bungalows set within generous plots, creating a valued sense of openness and privacy.
- This established character was already compromised by the approval of planning application 2007/92842, which allowed a full first floor extension at 68 Oxford Road, doubling the original floor area.
- The current proposal would create a dwelling four times larger than the floor area of the original 1950s bungalow.
- Such a substantial increase in scale would fundamentally alter the architectural character of the area. It would not provide any additional dwellings or significantly increase bedspaces; instead, it merely enlarges the existing accommodation for the benefit of the developer, to the detriment of neighbouring residents.
- The resulting building would dwarf the existing bungalows on both sides, appearing visually dominant and incongruous within the established streetscape.
- The unbalanced roof design and the inclusion of a roof terrace to the rear are unsympathetic to both the host dwelling and the surrounding area.
- The proposal fails to achieve a high standard of design and would appear visually discordant when viewed from neighbouring properties and gardens.
- The size of the property would be considerably larger than the original bungalow, this property has already been significantly extended approximately 15 years ago. This property is already more than adequate in number and size of rooms etc.
- The building lines are breached which is not acceptable.
- What started out as a small, two bedroom bungalow, was extended to what it is now, a very large four bedroomed, two storey house. This latest application would make the property an enormous house, extended front, back, both sides and roof height, which would be far too big in scale and size to any other property in WF13 4EH.
- This new application, with massively larger dimensions in height, width, depth and roof expanse, would make it more than 100% larger than the original footprint, and the largest property in WF13 4EH.
- The size of this plan seems to be unnecessary and too large it would look more like a hotel than a family home.
- This property originally a 1950s Bungalow has seen significant alterations in 2007 the new application seems to increase enormously being totally out of character, incongruous in comparison to its surrounding properties.
- The plans for this development seem excessive for the area, bearing in mind that this property initiated from a bungalow which has already been extended into a large house.

- The scale of this plan does not coincide with existing homes within the local area and is disproportionate and conflicts with Local Plan Policy LP24, which states that developments should respect their surroundings in terms of scale, layout and mass.
- The character of the area is well established and largely residential in nature. The proposal fails to respond appropriately to this context and would appear out of place when viewed from Reservoir Street.
- It would be visually intrusive and would undermine the character of the neighbourhood, again conflicting with Policy LP24.
- The development is an over intensification of the site and does not respect the nature of the existing residential area.
- The scale and density of what is being proposed are excessive for this location.
- The site is being pushed beyond what it can reasonably accommodate, resulting in a cramped and intrusive form of development. This approach is not in keeping with the character of Reservoir Street and conflicts with Local Plan Policy LP24.
- While front elevations may be visible from Oxford Road, the proposal fails to adequately consider the rear garden character when viewed from Reservoir Street. This is out of keeping with the established rear garden environment and would erode the residential character of the area, contrary to LP24(a) and NPPF Paragraph 135(c).
- I wish to object to this planning application due to the overbearing overall size of the proposed property.
- The proposed extension would make No. 68 a massive property, dominating the whole street scene - the actual blot on the landscape.
- I think this is an ill thought out application, for a huge property, out of keeping totally with the rest of WF13 4EH.
- The proposal would significantly alter the scale and mass of the original house to such an extent that it effectively creates a new, much larger dwelling, contrary to adopted guidance. Plot size alone does not justify excessive enlargement.
- This property has already been substantially extended in 2009/2010 to almost double its original size which was initially built as a bungalow.
- The Planning Statement acknowledges that the proposed extensions are “large” but concludes they are acceptable due to plot size. This approach fails to assess the cumulative impact of a two-storey rear extension, a single-storey rear extension, multiple balconies and increased height and bulk across the full rear elevation. Policy LP24(c) and the House Extensions SPD (Principle 2) require extensions to remain clearly subordinate to the host dwelling.
- This latest application takes the word extension to a whole new arena if granted (up on the roof, out to both sides, the back and frontage*). It seems

to me that, for a normal "family home", even an extended family one, the property would be for too large in size, scale and indoor facilities, to fit in with all other properties on the street scene. *

- I am submitting an objection to this planning application because of the sheer size of it, on a plot that was originally a small, 2 bedroom bungalow.
- The application should be refused, or substantially redesigned, including the removal of rear-facing balconies and a reduction in rear extension scale.

Residential Amenity

- The proposal includes a patio door and second floor roof terrace on the north elevation, which would directly overlook the private rear gardens of properties on Reservoir Street. This would result in a severe and unacceptable loss of privacy.
- The 2010 approval already introduced first floor and second floor bedroom windows that overlook these gardens, enabling views into previously private spaces while preserving the applicant's own privacy. The current application worsens this situation by moving first floor windows 4 metres closer to the rear boundary and adding the full height second floor patio door and roof terrace, significantly increasing opportunities for overlooking.
- There is no justification for an external amenity space at second floor level when the property benefits from a large rear garden.
- The proposed terrace serves no essential purpose and would cause substantial harm to neighbouring amenity.
- The proposed balconies to front and rear would be overlooking neighbours' properties resulting in loss of privacy, there are large gardens at the property making the necessity for such balconies unjustified
- My main concern is that the massive size of the proposed extension, together with a large balcony at the front of the house, would not only overlook Oxford Road in general, but would create a huge loss of privacy.
- As the proposals would be overbearing to almost all neighbouring properties, at the front and the back, I would urge you to refuse this application.
- It would be over-imposing and, given proposed front and rear balconies, a direct invasion of privacy to several surrounding properties.
- This plan would overlook and invade our privacy
- Being so close on all sides would take away its neighbours privacy
- There is an additional window shown on the proposed, east aspect, second floor plan, which will overlook my neighbour, in particular into his lounge side window, which the applicant failed to acknowledge, or show within their Planning Statement.
- This application will significantly compromise our privacy and the privacy of our surrounding neighbours.

- The positioning and proximity of the development would lead to our property being overlooked, not just our private garden area, but into our bedroom, living room and conservatory, reducing our ability to enjoy our current peaceful and private areas.
- It would dominate the current view we have and ruin our privacy and quality of life contravening Policy LP30, which aims to protect the privacy and amenity of existing residents.
- Do not allow this application on size, overbearing against near neighbours, and far reaching privacy issues for more than immediate neighbours.
- The proposal would also result in a serious loss of privacy.
- The positioning and proximity of the development would lead to overlooking of my property and neighbouring homes.
- This would affect both living rooms and private garden areas and would significantly reduce our ability to enjoy our homes in peace contrary to Local Plan Policy LP30.
- The development would feel overbearing.
- Due to its scale and closeness, it would dominate the outlook from neighbouring properties and create a sense of enclosure. This would harm the quality of life for residents and further conflicts with Policy LP30.
- This proposal would have a direct and harmful impact on my home and the surrounding properties.
- The Planning Statement relies heavily on the 45-degree rule to justify acceptability. This is misleading. The 45-degree rule is guidance only and does not assess overlooking from balconies, overbearing impact, loss of privacy and cumulative scale of development. Planning decisions must be based on overall amenity impact, not a single diagrammatic test. Over-reliance on this method results in an incomplete assessment.
- The Planning Statement states that views from the balconies would be limited and primarily toward the applicant’s own garden. This is incorrect. The balconies are elevated and rear-facing, and my property at 2 Reservoir Street sits directly behind the site, meaning the proposals would enable direct overlooking into private rear garden space. No meaningful mitigation (such as obscure screening or balcony redesign) is proposed, and reliance on existing trees is unreliable given seasonal changes.
- It would be horrendous for the occupier of the small bungalow at 66 Oxford Road, with car headlights / rear lights, constantly shining into his lounge side and front windows.
- It is already imposing, compared to neighbouring properties, and can readily and easily be seen from Oxford Road. Any further front, west or east side extensions will interfere greatly with the privacy of neighbours both sides, and the 2 x 1940's detached houses directly opposite.
- The Planning Statement concludes that the extensions would not be overbearing due to retained distances and roof design. However, this

underestimates the impact of the combined height, depth and mass of the rear extensions when viewed from Reservoir Street.

- The cumulative built form would create a dominant rear elevation, resulting in a sense of enclosure and loss of outlook from neighbouring properties, including No. 2 Reservoir Street. Distance alone does not remove the perception of dominance, particularly in rear garden contexts.
- This latest plan is to further extend No. 68 Oxford Road, WF13 4EH, to what appears to have, in effect, 3 storeys - ground, first and second floors had an extensive view into almost all neighbouring properties.
- With the plans wanting a 3rd storey with balcony and terrace at that level, and that on a large rear extension, the occupiers will have a far reaching, and closer, view of immediate neighbours and beyond; their privacy would be very much compromised.
- Any person standing, or sitting, on the proposed balcony at the front of the house would look directly into my lounge; another unacceptable breach of my privacy.
- The owner, although not living there, has already put a large spotlight on the front of the house, which is lit from dusk until dawn, and intrudes on my enjoyment in my own home. It shines directly into the large side window of my lounge, causing me to have my blinds closed most of the time. I dread to think what will happen if he gets permission to build this monstrous extension.
- They have submitted a photograph showing no windows at all on the side of my property, adjacent to his. That photograph has been taken from the rear of my garage, which does not have a side window. More importantly, it does not show that my large, lounge side window faces the side and front of the existing house.
- As they want to build out further to the east side, bringing a massive wall very much closer to my small bungalow, as well as making the whole property enormous in relation to other properties around it, including a higher roof line, it would block all the light to my lounge, which is not acceptable at all.

<u>Trees</u>

- The applicant states there are NO trees or hedges on the property or on adjoining properties which are within falling distance of the proposed development.
- There are, in fact, several large, well established, trees within the rear garden of No. 68, including one particular tree which is at least twice the size of the current roof height of No. 68.
- If this fell, it could cause catastrophic damage to No. 2 Reservoir Street - directly behind No. 68 Oxford Road - and / or to the host property in its present large form, let alone should the extensive rear extension be granted.

- If they chop down the big trees in the back garden (which they say are non-existent according to their application form), it will make the privacy issue for the people behind him on Reservoir Street much greater.

Noise

- The building work would also cause serious noise pollution

Other Matters

- A restrictive covenant applies to all properties on this stretch of road, requiring the preservation of landscaped front gardens. The proposed encroachment would therefore be inappropriate and harmful to the uniformity of the street scene.
- The property is fully visible from the roadside and the application states it is not visible from the road which is entirely wrong.
- For a start, there are Restrictive Covenants along the whole of Oxford Road which forbid building in front of the 60ft Building Line. This application seems to want to build anything up to 2.7 metres in front of that line. Nobody else has been allowed to do that.
- The Covenants also state that front gardens should be kept as ornamental gardens, not car parks, so that part of the application would also break the Covenants.
- This is completely unacceptable, especially as, if their plans were accepted, and the Covenants ignored, the frontage would be almost 3 metres nearer. Their planning statement says the existing property can't be seen from Oxford Road. That is completely untrue; it is plainly obvious in its present state, let alone if the application was approved.
- The Planning Statement shows large properties opposite, failing to state #68 is already as large, if not larger, than those shown.
- Enforceable (and upheld) Restrictive Covenants apply along the whole of Oxford Road, including an established 60' Building Line. These plans show a planned encroachment of that Line by (a) 1.8 metres (Planning Statement) or (b) 2.7 metres (Plans), depending on which one is to be believed, though neither should be allowed.
- There is a lounge side window at #66 which is not shown on the application; they have used a misleading photograph of #66's garage instead!
- The planning application states the existing property cannot be viewed from Oxford Road. That is a complete falsehood; it can be seen from Oxford Road and Staincliffe Road at its present size, let alone if extended further.
- Most importantly the proposed increase in frontage of the property plus the canopy which in future could be enclosed without consent or regulation is a direct breach of the Building Line Covenant that has been observed in all past approved application

- The harm caused by this proposal is significant and is not outweighed by any clear public benefit.
- The application prioritises maximising development on the site over the wellbeing of existing residents.
- If the Council is minded to approve this application, I ask that it is referred to the Planning Committee for determination rather than being decided under delegated powers due to the level of impact on neighbouring residents
- Significant emphasis is placed on the applicant's personal circumstances, investment intentions, and design aspirations. These are not material planning considerations and cannot outweigh harm to neighbouring residential amenity.
- There are Restrictive Covenants in place along the whole of Oxford Road, Staincliffe Road end to Halifax Road end, which state that, among other things, the frontage of no property or building should be more than 60ft in front of the Building Line.
- This has been upheld with all planning applications, including the Nursing/Care Home almost completed on what were the old tennis courts, opposite the school plying fields. They originally wanted to build nearer Oxford Road, but were not allowed to do that, and changed their plans accordingly.
- The Planning Statement for 68 shows an area (in orange) earmarked for housing. This is not a true statement, because that area is, in fact, that being built on as the Nursing / Care Home.
- The planning application itself states the existing property, which is in itself large due to previous extensions, cannot be seen from Oxford Road.
- The Restrictive Covenants also state that the front gardens should be maintained as ornamental gardens, so the fact this application wants to turn the front garden to a car park, is another breach of the Covenants.
- They want to build over the 60' building line set out in Restrictive Covenants, that have never been allowed to be broken - even then they have given 2 different measurements - 1.8 metres and 2.7 metres; which is it, although neither should apply due to the Covenants?
- They have shown an area along Oxford Road, marked in Orange on their supporting papers, as "... allocated for housing ...". That is totally not true; the land is currently being developed as a Care Home - almost completed - and they were not allowed to build in front of the 60' building line, nor has anyone else, despite a large number of extensions to properties over the years.
- The existing house has one large window in the front roof area (next to the chimney outlet) that was not on the original plans to build the second storey. The previous occupant merely asked builders doing an extension nearby to

put the new window in, which they did (I think without contacting the Council).

Consultation Responses
The following is a brief summary of Consultee advice (more details are contained in the 'Assessment' section of the report, where appropriate):

KC Trees – No objection

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. The most relevant policies for consideration in this case are:

Kirklees Local Plan Policies
- **LP 1** - Achieving Sustainable Development
- **LP 2** - Place Shaping
- **LP 21** - Highways and Access
- **LP 22** - Parking
- **LP 24** - Design
- **LP 30** - Biodiversity and Geodiversity
- **LP 33** - Trees
- **LP 52** - Protection and Improvement of Environmental Quality

Supplementary Planning Guidance/Documents:
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.

In this case, the following SPDs are applicable:
- Highways Design Guide SPD (adopted 4th November 2019)
- House Extensions and Alterations SPD (adopted 29th June 2021)

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, 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 2** - Achieving Sustainable Development
- **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

Assessment

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 on the application site is considered acceptable, and shall be assessed against other material planning considerations, including visual and residential amenity, as well as highway safety.

2. Impact on Visual Amenity

Key Design Principle 1 of the House Extensions & Alterations Supplementary Planning Document (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 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 NPPF offers guidance relating to design in Chapter 12 (achieving well designed places) whereby Paragraph 131 provides a principal consideration concerning design which states: *"The creation of high quality, beautiful and sustainable buildings and places is fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve. Good design is a key aspect of*

sustainable development, creates better places in which to live and work and helps make development acceptable to communities."

Single Storey Side Extension

The proposed single storey extension would project approximately 3.6m from the east facing side elevation and approximately 5.95m from the rear elevation of the host dwelling. The enlargement would be faced in stone and would incorporate a pitched roof finished in tiles to match the appearance of the original build. Although the extension would have a large footprint, it would be set back approximately 2.3m from the principal elevation and would retain a distance of approximately 24.5m to the pavement along Oxford Road which would reduce its prominence and visibility from public vantage points. On this basis, the proposed development would respect the visual amenity of the host property and wider street scene and would be acceptable.

Two Storey Rear Extension

The two-storey extension would project approximately 4m from the rear elevation of the original dwellinghouse. The enlargement would be faced in stone and would incorporate a dual-pitched roof finished in tiles to match the appearance of the original build. Whilst the extension would have a large footprint, it would feature a lower ridge line which would enhance its subservience to the original build. Furthermore, the extension would have limited visibility from public vantage points due its location at the rear of the dwelling. Additionally, with regard to its scale, it is considered that the property and its curtilage would support the extension without it appearing incongruous or amounting to overdevelopment. Therefore, it is considered that the proposed development would respect the character and appearance of the host property and wider street scene.

Two Storey Front Extension

The proposed two storey extension would have a maximum projection of approximately 2.4m from the front elevation of the original dwellinghouse. The enlargement would be constructed in stone and would incorporate a dual-pitched roof finished in tiles to match the appearance of the host property. Although the extension would project forward of the principal elevation, it would have an acceptable scale and would feature a lower ridge line. Furthermore, the enlargement would retain a distance of approximately 22.2m from the public pavement along Oxford Road which would reduce its prominence from vantage points. On this basis, it is considered that the proposals would unduly harm the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area and cannot be supported in terms of visual amenity.

Roof Alterations

The submitted plans confirm that roof alterations would be undertaken as part of the application. Whilst it is noted that the overall height of the property would increase by approximately 0.4m, it is considered that the alterations would not appear out of character with other properties in the street scene, where there is a combination of both single storey and two storey properties.

Front Canopy

The canopy would extend approximately 1.4m from the front elevation of the proposed two storey front extensions. Whilst it is acknowledged that front canopies are not a common feature within the street scene, it is noted that the structure would have a modest scale and would appear subservient to the original build. Furthermore, the canopy would be set back approximately 20.8m from the public pavement and would not appear overly prominent from vantage points along Oxford Road. Therefore, it is considered that the proposed development would be acceptable in terms of visual amenity.

Velux Windows

The submitted plans confirm that two Velux windows would be installed within the south-facing roof plane of the dwelling. Given that the roof lights proposed would be of an appropriate design and scale, they are considered to respect the appearance and character of the host property and surrounding area.

Rear Dormer Extension

The dormer extension proposed would be located within the rear roof plane. Although no details have been provided regarding the material palette, a condition has been added requiring the dormer extension to be faced in tiles to match the existing roof. The dormer would be set back from the eaves and below the ridge line and would not dominate the rear roof plane. The dormer windows would also be of an appropriate size and design and would generally align with the existing fenestration. Whilst it is noted that dormer extensions aren't a common feature within the street scene, in this instance, the dormer is considered acceptable given the lack of uniformity within the street scene and that it would have limited visibility from public vantage points due to its siting at the rear. Therefore, the proposed development would be acceptable from a visual amenity perspective

Rear Balcony

The submitted plans confirm that a balcony/terrace would be created within the rear roof plane as part of the application. The balcony would project approximately 4.6m from the rear elevation of the proposed dormer extension. Due to its siting, the proposed development would have limited visibility from public vantage points and is not considered to have a significant visual impact on the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area.

Alterations to Fenestration

The application would see alterations made to the fenestration within the eastern and western elevations of the property. Given that the fenestration proposed would be in keeping with the style of the original build, it is considered that the proposed alterations would respect the visual amenity of the host dwelling and the surrounding area.

Summary

Having taken the above into account, the proposed development would not cause any significant harm to the visual amenity of either the host dwelling or the wider street scene, complying with Policy LP24 of the Kirklees Local Plan, KDP 1 & 2 of the House Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document and the aims of Chapter 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

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 SPD goes into further detail with respect to Key Design Principle 3 on privacy, Key Design Principle 5 on overshadowing/loss of light, Key Design Principle 6 on preventing overbearing impact and Key Principle 7 for outdoor space.

Impact on 2 Reservoir Street

2 Reservoir Street is a two-storey detached property located north of the application site. It is noted that the proposed development would occupy a position approximately 27.8m from the rear elevation of no.2. Given that the separation distance retained would be sufficient, it is considered that there would be no significant detrimental impact on the neighbour's residential amenity as a result of the proposed works.

Impact on 70 Oxford Road

70 Oxford Road is a detached bungalow located to the west and occupies a position on lower ground relative to the application site. The submitted plans confirm that a separation distance of 6.3m would be retained to the proposed single storey side extension and a distance of 9.9m would be retained to the proposed two storey extensions. Whilst the enlargements would project beyond the front and rear elevations of the neighbouring dwelling, they would accord with 45 degree rule in relation to the neighbour's fenestration and would be acceptable in this regard.

Furthermore, it is noted that a new first floor window would be installed within the western elevation of the dwelling. Whilst this window would serve a landing, which is a non-habitable room, a condition requiring the window to be obscure glazed will be added to the decision notice to prevent any detrimental harm to the neighbouring occupants in relation to residential amenity.

Impact on 129 and 131 Oxford Road

129 and 131 Oxford Road are residential properties situated south of the application site. It is noted that the proposed development would occupy a position approximately 51m from the front elevations of no.129 and 131. Given that the separation distances retained would be substantial, it is considered that there would be no significant detrimental impact on the neighbour's residential amenity as a result of the proposed development.

Impact on 66 Oxford Road

66 Oxford Road is a detached bungalow located to the east and occupies a position on higher ground relative to the application site. The submitted plans demonstrate that the proposed two storey extensions are largely in line with the front and rear elevations of no.66 and would accord with the 45 degree rule. It is noted that the neighbouring property features a modest window within its eastern side elevation. However, this window would be of secondary use and as such, would not warrant the same protection. On this basis, officers consider that there would not cause any additional overlooking, overbearing or overshadowing harm to the residential amenity of the neighbouring occupants, over and above the existing arrangements on site.

Furthermore, it is noted that several windows would be installed within the eastern elevation of the dwelling as part of the application. Whilst these windows would serve an ensuite and kitchen, which are non-habitable rooms, a condition requiring the window to be obscure glazed will be added to the decision notice to prevent any detrimental harm to the neighbouring occupants in relation to residential amenity.

Occupier Amenity

The plans confirm that sufficient outdoor amenity space of a functional layout would be retained at the site. On this basis, the proposed works would ensure an acceptable standard of amenity for existing and future occupants.

Summary

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 and Alterations SPD and Paragraph 135(f) of the National Planning Policy Framework.

4. Impact on Highway Safety

Local Plan Policies LP21 and LP22 of the Kirklees Local Plan are relevant and seek to ensure that proposals do not have a detrimental impact on highway safety and provide sufficient parking. Furthermore, Paragraph 116 of the NPPF states that development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe.

The proposed alterations would not intensify the domestic use at the dwelling or affect the existing parking arrangements on site. Therefore, the development is considered acceptable in accordance with Policies LP21 and LP22 of the KLP, Chapter 9 of the NPPF, Principles 15 and 16 of the Kirklees House Extensions and Alterations SPD and the Highways Design Guide SPD.

5. Other Matters

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 relevant to the determination of this application.

Trees

KC Trees were formally consulted on the application and did initially object to the scheme due to the proposal's impact on the nearby trees and hedges and the lack of tree information. However, following the submission of amended drawings, KC Trees have since confirmed that they have no further objection to the scheme.

There are no other matters relevant to the determination of this application.

6. Representations

Fifteen representations were received following the statutory publicity. The comments made have been summarised, arranged into themes and addressed below:

Supporting Comments (1 Representation)

- I live at the bungalow (No.70) next door, and I fully support this development.

- I have looked at the plans and information submitted and feel that this is an excellent development that will improve the house and uplift the neighbourhood.
- The development will not affect me in any way. A large amount of space will be left between my boundary and the neighbours boundary.
- There are large properties in the area, and I do not have an issue with another well-designed property next to me.
- The larger extension is at the back of the house.
- The front extension looks a quality design.
- Overall, the extensions will be proportionate to the plot size and area. I fully support the extensions and positive changes being made as they will enhance the area in a positive manner and won't be harmful to any of the neighbours.
- Larger properties are needed in the Dewsbury area for its residents, and I welcome such applications which have used planning guidance and the Councils policies in the correct manner.

Objections (14 Representations)

Visual Amenity

- The dwelling is wholly unsympathetic to the character and appearance of the immediately adjacent properties and the wider residential area.
- The proposed bay window and entrance canopy to the front elevation would project beyond the established building line on Oxford Road.
- The houses on the north side of Oxford Road and the south side of Reservoir Street were constructed in the late 1950s as modest single storey bungalows set within generous plots, creating a valued sense of openness and privacy.
- This established character was already compromised by the approval of planning application 2007/92842, which allowed a full first floor extension at 68 Oxford Road, doubling the original floor area.
- The current proposal would create a dwelling four times larger than the floor area of the original 1950s bungalow.
- Such a substantial increase in scale would fundamentally alter the architectural character of the area. It would not provide any additional dwellings or significantly increase bedspaces; instead, it merely enlarges the existing accommodation for the benefit of the developer, to the detriment of neighbouring residents.
- The resulting building would dwarf the existing bungalows on both sides, appearing visually dominant and incongruous within the established streetscape.
- The unbalanced roof design and the inclusion of a roof terrace to the rear are unsympathetic to both the host dwelling and the surrounding area.
- The proposal fails to achieve a high standard of design and would appear visually discordant when viewed from neighbouring properties and gardens.

- The size of the property would be considerably larger than the original bungalow, this property has already been significantly extended approximately 15 years ago. This property is already more than adequate in number and size of rooms etc.
- The building lines are breached which is not acceptable.
- What started out as a small, two bedroom bungalow, was extended to what it is now, a very large four bedroomed, two storey house. This latest application would make the property an enormous house, extended front, back, both sides and roof height, which would be far too big in scale and size to any other property in WF13 4EH.
- This new application, with massively larger dimensions in height, width, depth and roof expanse, would make it more than 100% larger than the original footprint, and the largest property in WF13 4EH.
- The size of this plan seems to be unnecessary and too large it would look more like a hotel than a family home.
- This property originally a 1950s Bungalow has seen significant alterations in 2007 the new application seems to increase enormously being totally out of character, incongruous in comparison to its surrounding properties.
- The plans for this development seem excessive for the area, bearing in mind that this property initiated from a bungalow which has already been extended into a large house.
- The scale of this plan does not coincide with existing homes within the local area and is disproportionate and conflicts with Local Plan Policy LP24, which states that developments should respect their surroundings in terms of scale, layout and mass.
- The character of the area is well established and largely residential in nature. The proposal fails to respond appropriately to this context and would appear out of place when viewed from Reservoir Street.
- It would be visually intrusive and would undermine the character of the neighbourhood, again conflicting with Policy LP24.
- The development is an over intensification of the site and does not respect the nature of the existing residential area.
- The scale and density of what is being proposed are excessive for this location.
- The site is being pushed beyond what it can reasonably accommodate, resulting in a cramped and intrusive form of development. This approach is not in keeping with the character of Reservoir Street and conflicts with Local Plan Policy LP24.
- While front elevations may be visible from Oxford Road, the proposal fails to adequately consider the rear garden character when viewed from Reservoir Street. This is out of keeping with the established rear garden environment and would erode the residential character of the area, contrary to LP24(a) and NPPF Paragraph 135(c).

- I wish to object to this planning application due to the overbearing overall size of the proposed property.
- The proposed extension would make No. 68 a massive property, dominating the whole street scene - the actual blot on the landscape.
- I think this is an ill thought out application, for a huge property, out of keeping totally with the rest of WF13 4EH.
- The proposal would significantly alter the scale and mass of the original house to such an extent that it effectively creates a new, much larger dwelling, contrary to adopted guidance. Plot size alone does not justify excessive enlargement.
- This property has already been substantially extended in 2009/2010 to almost double its original size which was initially built as a bungalow.
- The Planning Statement acknowledges that the proposed extensions are “large” but concludes they are acceptable due to plot size. This approach fails to assess the cumulative impact of a two-storey rear extension, a single-storey rear extension, multiple balconies and increased height and bulk across the full rear elevation. Policy LP24(c) and the House Extensions SPD (Principle 2) require extensions to remain clearly subordinate to the host dwelling.
- This latest application takes the word extension to a whole new arena if granted (up on the roof, out to both sides, the back and frontage*). It seems to me that, for a normal "family home", even an extended family one, the property would be for too large in size, scale and indoor facilities, to fit in with all other properties on the street scene. *
- I am submitting an objection to this planning application because of the sheer size of it, on a plot that was originally a small, 2 bedroom bungalow.
- The application should be refused, or substantially redesigned, including the removal of rear-facing balconies and a reduction in rear extension scale.

Officer Response: *The proposal’s potential impact on the appearance and character of the street scene has been assessed within the ‘visual amenity’ section of the report.*

<u>Residential Amenity</u>

- The proposal includes a patio door and second floor roof terrace on the north elevation, which would directly overlook the private rear gardens of properties on Reservoir Street. This would result in a severe and unacceptable loss of privacy.
- The 2010 approval already introduced first floor and second floor bedroom windows that overlook these gardens, enabling views into previously private spaces while preserving the applicant’s own privacy. The current application worsens this situation by moving first floor windows 4 metres closer to the

rear boundary and adding the full height second floor patio door and roof terrace, significantly increasing opportunities for overlooking.

- There is no justification for an external amenity space at second floor level when the property benefits from a large rear garden.
- The proposed terrace serves no essential purpose and would cause substantial harm to neighbouring amenity.
- The proposed balconies to front and rear would be overlooking neighbours' properties resulting in loss of privacy, there are large gardens at the property making the necessity for such balconies unjustified
- My main concern is that the massive size of the proposed extension, together with a large balcony at the front of the house, would not only overlook Oxford Road in general, but would create a huge loss of privacy.
- As the proposals would be overbearing to almost all neighbouring properties, at the front and the back, I would urge you to refuse this application.
- It would be over-imposing and, given proposed front and rear balconies, a direct invasion of privacy to several surrounding properties.
- This plan would overlook and invade our privacy
- Being so close on all sides would take away its neighbours privacy
- There is an additional window shown on the proposed, east aspect, second floor plan, which will overlook my neighbour, in particular into his lounge side window, which the applicant failed to acknowledge, or show within their Planning Statement.
- This application will significantly compromise our privacy and the privacy of our surrounding neighbours.
- The positioning and proximity of the development would lead to our property being overlooked, not just our private garden area, but into our bedroom, living room and conservatory, reducing our ability to enjoy our current peaceful and private areas.
- It would dominate the current view we have and ruin our privacy and quality of life contravening Policy LP30, which aims to protect the privacy and amenity of existing residents.
- Do not allow this application on size, overbearing against near neighbours, and far reaching privacy issues for more than immediate neighbours.
- The proposal would also result in a serious loss of privacy.
- The positioning and proximity of the development would lead to overlooking of my property and neighbouring homes.
- This would affect both living rooms and private garden areas and would significantly reduce our ability to enjoy our homes in peace contrary to Local Plan Policy LP30.
- The development would feel overbearing.

- Due to its scale and closeness, it would dominate the outlook from neighbouring properties and create a sense of enclosure. This would harm the quality of life for residents and further conflicts with Policy LP30.
- This proposal would have a direct and harmful impact on my home and the surrounding properties.
- The Planning Statement relies heavily on the 45-degree rule to justify acceptability. This is misleading. The 45-degree rule is guidance only and does not assess overlooking from balconies, overbearing impact, loss of privacy and cumulative scale of development. Planning decisions must be based on overall amenity impact, not a single diagrammatic test. Over-reliance on this method results in an incomplete assessment.
- The Planning Statement states that views from the balconies would be limited and primarily toward the applicant's own garden. This is incorrect. The balconies are elevated and rear-facing, and my property at 2 Reservoir Street sits directly behind the site, meaning the proposals would enable direct overlooking into private rear garden space. No meaningful mitigation (such as obscure screening or balcony redesign) is proposed, and reliance on existing trees is unreliable given seasonal changes.
- It would be horrendous for the occupier of the small bungalow at 66 Oxford Road, with car headlights / rear lights, constantly shining into his lounge side and front windows.
- It is already imposing, compared to neighbouring properties, and can readily and easily be seen from Oxford Road. Any further front, west or east side extensions will interfere greatly with the privacy of neighbours both sides, and the 2 x 1940's detached houses directly opposite.
- The Planning Statement concludes that the extensions would not be overbearing due to retained distances and roof design. However, this underestimates the impact of the combined height, depth and mass of the rear extensions when viewed from Reservoir Street.
- The cumulative built form would create a dominant rear elevation, resulting in a sense of enclosure and loss of outlook from neighbouring properties, including No. 2 Reservoir Street. Distance alone does not remove the perception of dominance, particularly in rear garden contexts.
- This latest plan is to further extend No. 68 Oxford Road, WF13 4EH, to what appears to have, in effect, 3 storeys - ground, first and second floors had an extensive view into almost all neighbouring properties.
- With the plans wanting a 3rd storey with balcony and terrace at that level, and that on a large rear extension, the occupiers will have a far reaching, and closer, view of immediate neighbours and beyond; their privacy would be very much compromised.
- Any person standing, or sitting, on the proposed balcony at the front of the house would look directly into my lounge; another unacceptable breach of my privacy.

- The owner, although not living there, has already put a large spotlight on the front of the house, which is lit from dusk until dawn, and intrudes on my enjoyment in my own home. It shines directly into the large side window of my lounge, causing me to have my blinds closed most of the time. I dread to think what will happen if he gets permission to build this monstrous extension.
- They have submitted a photograph showing no windows at all on the side of my property, adjacent to his. That photograph has been taken from the rear of my garage, which does not have a side window. More importantly, it does not show that my large, lounge side window faces the side and front of the existing house.
- As they want to build out further to the east side, bringing a massive wall very much closer to my small bungalow, as well as making the whole property enormous in relation to other properties around it, including a higher roof line, it would block all the light to my lounge, which is not acceptable at all.

Officer Response: *The proposal's potential impact on the neighbouring properties has been assessed within the 'Residential Amenity' section of the report.*

<u>Trees</u>

- The applicant states there are NO trees or hedges on the property or on adjoining properties which are within falling distance of the proposed development.
- There are, in fact, several large, well established, trees within the rear garden of No. 68, including one particular tree which is at least twice the size of the current roof height of No. 68.
- If this fell, it could cause catastrophic damage to No. 2 Reservoir Street - directly behind No. 68 Oxford Road - and / or to the host property in its present large form, let alone should the extensive rear extension be granted.
- If they chop down the big trees in the back garden (which they say are non-existent according to their application form), it will make the privacy issue for the people behind him on Reservoir Street much greater.

Officer Response: *Officers formally consulted with KC Trees following a site visit to the property. KC Trees following the submission of revised drawings confirmed that they have no objection to the proposed scheme from an arboricultural perspective.*

<u>Noise</u>

- The building work would also cause serious noise pollution

Officer Response: *Impacts from construction works are temporary and would not constitute a material planning consideration. However, an informative detailing construction hours has been added to the decision notice to minimise noise disturbance during the construction period.*

Other Matters

- A restrictive covenant applies to all properties on this stretch of road, requiring the preservation of landscaped front gardens. The proposed encroachment would therefore be inappropriate and harmful to the uniformity of the street scene.
- The property is fully visible from the roadside and the application states it is not visible from the road which is entirely wrong.
- For a start, there are Restrictive Covenants along the whole of Oxford Road which forbid building in front of the 60ft Building Line. This application seems to want to build anything up to 2.7 metres in front of that line. Nobody else has been allowed to do that.
- The Covenants also state that front gardens should be kept as ornamental gardens, not car parks, so that part of the application would also break the Covenants.
- This is completely unacceptable, especially as, if their plans were accepted, and the Covenants ignored, the frontage would be almost 3 metres nearer. Their planning statement says the existing property can't be seen from Oxford Road. That is completely untrue; it is plainly obvious in its present state, let alone if the application was approved.
- The Planning Statement shows large properties opposite, failing to state #68 is already as large, if not larger, than those shown.
- Enforceable (and upheld) Restrictive Covenants apply along the whole of Oxford Road, including an established 60' Building Line. These plans show a planned encroachment of that Line by (a) 1.8 metres (Planning Statement) or (b) 2.7 metres (Plans), depending on which one is to be believed, though neither should be allowed.
- There is a lounge side window at #66 which is not shown on the application; they have used a misleading photograph of #66's garage instead!
- The planning application states the existing property cannot be viewed from Oxford Road. That is a complete falsehood; it can be seen from Oxford Road and Staincliffe Road at its present size, let alone if extended further.
- Most importantly the proposed increase in frontage of the property plus the canopy which in future could be enclosed without consent or regulation is a direct breach of the Building Line Covenant that has been observed in all past approved application
- The harm caused by this proposal is significant and is not outweighed by any clear public benefit.

- The application prioritises maximising development on the site over the wellbeing of existing residents.
- If the Council is minded to approve this application, I ask that it is referred to the Planning Committee for determination rather than being decided under delegated powers due to the level of impact on neighbouring residents
- Significant emphasis is placed on the applicant's personal circumstances, investment intentions, and design aspirations. These are not material planning considerations and cannot outweigh harm to neighbouring residential amenity.
- There are Restrictive Covenants in place along the whole of Oxford Road, Staincliffe Road end to Halifax Road end, which state that, among other things, the frontage of no property or building should be more than 60ft in front of the Building Line.
- This has been upheld with all planning applications, including the Nursing/Care Home almost completed on what were the old tennis courts, opposite the school plying fields. They originally wanted to build nearer Oxford Road, but were not allowed to do that, and changed their plans accordingly.
- The Planning Statement for 68 shows an area (in orange) earmarked for housing. This is not a true statement, because that area is, in fact, that being built on as the Nursing / Care Home.
- The planning application itself states the existing property, which is in itself large due to previous extensions, cannot be seen from Oxford Road.
- The Restrictive Covenants also state that the front gardens should be maintained as ornamental gardens, so the fact this application wants to turn the front garden to a car park, is another breach of the Covenants.
- They want to build over the 60' building line set out in Restrictive Covenants, that have never been allowed to be broken - even then they have given 2 different measurements - 1.8 metres and 2.7 metres; which is it, although neither should apply due to the Covenants?
- They have shown an area along Oxford Road, marked in Orange on their supporting papers, as "... allocated for housing ...". That is totally not true; the land is currently being developed as a Care Home - almost completed - and they were not allowed to build in front of the 60' building line, nor has anyone else, despite a large number of extensions to properties over the years.
- The existing house has one large window in the front roof area (next to the chimney outlet) that was not on the original plans to build the second storey. The previous occupant merely asked builders doing an extension nearby to put the new window in, which they did (I think without contacting the Council).

Officer Response: *Issues relating to covenants would be a private matter and would not constitute a material planning consideration. Furthermore, the application will be determined under delegated powers and does not require a planning committee decision. All other matters would not constitute material planning considerations.*

7. Negotiations

The Case Officer undertook negotiations with the agent to secure amended plans. The revised drawings received addressed KC Trees comments and were considered acceptable. Officers did not consider it necessary to readvertise the application given that only minor amendments were made to the scheme.

8. Conclusion

This application for the erection of two storey front extension with balcony, a two storey rear extension, a single storey side extension and balcony to the rear roof slope with associated alterations at 68 Oxford Road has been assessed against relevant policies in the development plan as listed in the policy section of the report, the House Extensions and Alterations SPD, the National Planning Policy Framework and other material considerations. Given the acceptable design and lack of harm in terms of visual and residential amenity, the proposed development is considered to be acceptable.

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 constitute sustainable development and is therefore recommended for approval.

Recommendation: Approve
Decision Authorisation - Delegated Powers
Application Number: 2025/93313
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.

2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in complete accordance with the plans and specifications schedule 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 to ensure the satisfactory appearance of the development on completion, and to accord with Policy LP1, LP2, LP21, LP22, LP24, LP30, LP33 and LP52 of the Kirklees Local Plan, Key Design Principles 1 & 2 of the House Extensions and Alterations SPD and the aims of the National Planning Policy Framework.

3. The external walls and roofing materials of the extensions hereby approved shall in all respects match those used in the construction of the existing building and be retained thereafter.
Reason: In the interests of visual amenity and to accord with Policy LP24 of the Kirklees Local Plan, Key Design Principles 1 & 2 of the House Extensions and Alterations SPD and the aims of Chapter 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

4. The external alterations hereby approved shall in all respects match those used in the construction of the existing building and be retained thereafter.
Reason: In the interests of visual amenity and to accord with Policy LP24 of the Kirklees Local Plan, Key Design Principles 1 & 2 of the House Extensions and Alterations SPD and the aims of Chapter 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

5. Notwithstanding the submitted plans and details, the rear dormer extension hereby approved shall be tiles and retained thereafter.
Reason: In the interests of visual amenity and to accord with Policy LP24 of the Kirklees Local Plan, Key Design Principles 1 & 2 of the House Extensions and Alterations SPD and the aims of Chapter 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

6. Notwithstanding the submitted plans and details, the new ground and first floor windows located within the side elevations of the dwelling shall be fitted with obscure glazing to at least Level 3 on the Pilkington Scale and non-opening to a height of no less than 1.7m above floor level and retained as such thereafter.
Reason: In the interests of residential amenity and to accord with Policy LP24 of the Kirklees Local Plan, the House Extensions and Alterations SPD and the National Planning Policy Framework.

NOTE: The granting of planning permission does not override any private legal rights or consents that may be required. It is the responsibility of the applicant / developer to ensure that all appropriate consents are in place prior to any development commencing; during the period of construction existing access for neighbouring properties is maintained; and no damage is caused to the access driveway or surrounding properties.

NOTE: To minimise noise disturbance at nearby premises it is generally recommended that activities relating to the erection, construction, alteration, repair or maintenance of buildings, structures or roads shall not take place outside the hours of:

- 07.30 and 18.30 hours, Mondays to Fridays
- 08.00 and 13.00hours, Saturdays
- With no working Sundays or Public Holidays

In some cases, different site-specific hours of operation may be appropriate. Under the Control of Pollution Act 1974, Section 60 Kirklees Environment and Transportation Services can control noise from construction sites by serving a notice. This notice can specify the hours during which the works may be carried out.

Plans and specifications schedule: -
Plans and specifications schedule: -

Plan Type	**Reference**	**Revision**	**Date Received**
Location Plan	PP-14531972v1	-	02/12/2025
Existing Plans & Elevations	2665 (0-) 01	-	02/12/2025
Proposed Plans & Elevations	3665 (0-) 02	D	25/05/2026
Proposed Site Plan	3665 (0-) 03	D	25/05/2026
Proposed Ground Floor Plan	3665 (0-) 04	C	25/05/2026
Proposed First Floor Plan	3665 (0-) 05	D	25/05/2026
Proposed Second Floor Plan	3665 (0-) 06	C	25/05/2026
Proposed North & South Elevation	3665 (0-) 07	D	25/05/2026
Proposed East & West Elevation	3665 (0-) 08	C	25/05/2026
Climate Change Statement	-	-	02/12/2025
Arboricultural Impact Assessment	09.03.2026		10/03/2026
Tree Constraint Plan	10.04.2026		10/04/2026

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 Case Officer undertook negotiations with the agent to secure amended plans. The revised drawings received addressed KC Trees comments and were considered acceptable.

Report Dated: 16/07/2026