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:	**2026/62/90022/W**
Site Address:	2, Co-op Lane, Holmbridge, Holmfirth, HD9 2ND
Description:	Erection of first floor Juliet balcony (within a Conservation Area)
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: 09-Apr-2026

The Site

2 Co-op Lane is an end-terrace property located in Holmbridge, Holmfirth. The building is split-level, appearing as two storeys from the west and as three storeys from the south, with an integral garage beneath. The property is constructed in stone and lies within a predominantly residential area, where surrounding buildings are similarly finished in stone with slate roofs. The majority of properties are two to three storeys, reflecting the sloping topography of the land, which falls to the south.

The site is situated within the Hinchliffe Mill Conservation Area and is positioned opposite two Grade II Listed Buildings: 1–2 Water Street to the south and 119 Woodhead Road to the west.

The development

The applicant is seeking planning permission for erection of first floor Juliet balcony (within a Conservation Area).

The Juliet balcony is positioned on the south-facing elevation and measures approximately 2m in height and 2.6m in width. It features a black steel balustrade 1.1m high at the front, with white uPVC sliding doors.

The balcony provides access to the kitchen/dining area.

The works are retrospective.

History of Negotiations

No amendments have been requested during the processing of this application, as it was considered they would not overcome the harm caused by the development.

Planning History

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

88/01536: Conversion of joinery workshop to 6 flats – Granted conditionally

89/06549: Conversion of joiners workshop and warehouse to 5 self-contained flats and 5 garages (within Conservation Area) – Granted conditionally

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 and a press notice.

Final publicity date expired: 5th March 2026

No representations were received as a result of the publicity.

Parish/ Town Council Comments

Holme Valley Parish Council: no comment. Defer to Kirklees officers.

Consultations

KC Conservation & Design: Verbal discussions undertaken, they advise that the development results in less than substantial harm to the setting of the Conservation Area. Comments discussed in further depth within the Assessment section of this report.

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) and the Holme Valley Neighbourhood Development Plan (adopted 8th December 2021).

The site is within the Strategic Green Infrastructure Network and Conservation Area as identified within the Kirklees Local Plan. The site is within landscape character area no.4 (LCA 4 - River Holme Settled Valley Floor) within the Holme Valley Neighbourhood Development Plan.

The site is also within an area with a known presence of bats.

A grade II listed building (1,2 Water Street, ref: 1134767) is to the south of the site at a distance of 6.6m at its closest point.

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

LP35 Historic Environment

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 12th December 2024, the Planning Practice Guidance Suite (PPGS) first launched 6th March 2014 together with Circulars, Ministerial Statements and associated technical guidance.

A consultation draft of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) was published on 16th December 2025. As a consultation, the document is at an early stage and subject to change. Accordingly, for the purposes of this application, no weight is given to the current consultation document.

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
Chapter16 – 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.

Section 72 of the Town & Country Planning (Listed Buildings & Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires Local Planning Authorities to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character of appearance of Conservation Areas.

When making a recommendation in respect of a planning application affecting a Listed Building or its setting, attention must be given to Section 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 which requires the Local Planning Authority to 'have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of a special architectural or historic interest which it possesses'

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".

The conclusion section of this report sets out the conclusions in relation to the principle of the development in light of all other material considerations

2 – Impact upon visual amenity (including impact upon the Conservation Area)

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.

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.

The application site is within Landscape Character Area 4, the River Holme Settled Valley Floor.
One key characteristic of the area is framed views from the settled valley floor to the upper valley sides and views across to opposing valley slopes and beyond towards the Peak District National Park.

- Framed views from the settled valley floor to the upper valley sides and views across to opposing valley slopes and beyond towards the Peak District National Park.
- Boundary treatments comprised largely of millstone grit walling. The stone walling which runs parallel with Upperthong Lane is representative of local vernacular detailing.
- A network of Public Rights of Way (PRoW) including the Holme Valley Riverside Way which follows the River Holme from Holmbridge through Holmfirth and downstream. National Cycle Route no. 68 follows minor roads through Upperthong towards the centre of Holmfirth before climbing the opposing valley slopes.
- Mill ponds reflect industrial heritage and offer recreation facilities.

Key built characteristic of the area are

- Mill buildings, chimneys and ponds, including Ribbleden Mill with its chimney, associated mill worker houses and ashlar fronted villas link the area to its industrial and commercial heritage and are a legacy of the area's former textile industry.
- Terraced cottages and distinctive over and under dwellings feature on the steep hillsides with steep ginnels, often with stone setts and narrow roads.
- Narrow winding streets with stepped passageways, stone troughs and setts characterise the sloping hillsides above Holmfirth town centre.
- Small tight knit settlements on the upper slopes are characterised by their former agricultural and domestic textile heritage.
- There are mixed areas of historic and more recent residential and commercial developments.

The application site is also located within Hinchliffe Mill Conservation Area. Section 72 of the Town & Country Planning (Listed Buildings & Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires Local Planning Authorities to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character of appearance of Conservation Areas. This is echoed within policy LP35 of the Kirklees Local Plan and Chapter 16 of the NPPF.

Paragraph 212 of the NPPF requires that when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset the Local Planning Authority should give great weight to the heritage asset's conservation irrespective of the level of harm.

LP35 of the Kirklees Local Plan requires that proposals should retain those elements of the historic environment which contribute to the distinct identity of the Kirklees area and ensure they are appropriately conserved, to the extent warranted by their significance, also having regard to the wider benefits of development. Consideration should be given to the need to ensure that proposals maintain and reinforce local distinctiveness and conserve the significance of designated and non-designated heritage assets.

At paragraphs 214 – 216 the NPPF is clear, that where development leads to substantial harm, this is necessary to achieve substantial public benefits that outweigh that harm or, in the case of less than substantial harm this should be weight against the public benefits of the development including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use.

In this context, preservation means not harming the interest of the building itself, or the wider conservation area within which it is set.

The development comprises the retrospective installation of a first-floor patio door opening with a Juliet balcony on the gable elevation of 2 Co-op Lane, within the Hinchliffe Mill Conservation Area. Owing to its elevated position, and orientation of the building in relation to the highway / in relation to neighbouring dwellings, the alteration is readily visible from surrounding public vantage points and forms a prominent feature in views of the building. No.2 Co-op Lane has a front / rear emphasis in relation to openings that provide outlook / natural light.

The opening measures approximately 2.6 metres in width and 2 metres in height, with a 1.1 metre high black steel balustrade positioned to the front. The scale of the opening is notably large and exceeds that of the existing garage opening at ground floor level. This results in a visually top-heavy composition, disrupting the established balance of the elevation. The width and height of the opening appear excessive in relation to the proportions of the host building. As a result, the feature does not read as a subordinate or integrated element, but instead as a dominant and incongruous intervention. This is further emphasised by its flush positioning within the wall, which lacks the depth and shadowing typically associated with traditional openings, increasing its visual prominence.

The use of white UPVC framing introduces a stark contrast with the surrounding building fabric and is visually at odds with the more traditional material palette characteristic of the Conservation Area. This further accentuates the presence of the opening within the streetscene.

In combination, the scale, proportions, materials, and positioning of the development result in a visually intrusive addition that appears incongruous within its context. The feature detracts from the character and appearance of both the host building and the wider Hinchliffe Mill Conservation Area, where more modest and proportionate openings are typical.

Kirklees Conservation and Design officers note the site occupies a sensitive and prominent position, opposite listed buildings which make a positive contribution to the setting of the Hinchliffe Mill Conservation Area.

In this case, Conservation officers consider the white UPVC door frame introduces a visually discordant element within the street scene. Its flat, modern finish and flush installation contrast markedly with the traditional materials, depth, and detailing that characterise the surrounding built environment. This stark contrast increases the visual prominence of the opening, causing it to appear incongruous and drawing undue attention away from the host building's original architectural features and the character of the Conservation Area. The impacts are further emphasised due to the buildings prominent siting, with the Juliet balcony proposed to a gable-end, which is visible from wider vantage points within the valley.

Therefore, taking into account the above, it is considered the development leads to less than substantial harm to the setting of the Conservation Area.

In accordance with paragraph 215 of the NPPF, where a development will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the development including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use.

In this case, the benefits of the development are limited to the provision of improved natural light to the occupants of 2 Co-op Lane. The submitted floor plans demonstrate that the kitchen/dining room served by the Juliet balcony is already well served by four openings on the front elevation. As such, officers afford limited weight to an argument that the development is necessary to secure the building's optimum viable use, given that the additional opening serves an already adequately lit habitable space. These benefits are therefore private in nature and relate solely to the amenity of the occupants. Consequently, officers consider that no public benefits arise from the development that outweigh the identified less than substantial harm to the Holmfirth Conservation Area.

The impact of the development upon the wider Conservation Area and the visual amenity of the host property is concluded to be harmful and the development fails to preserve the setting of the Conservation Area in this

case. Furthermore, the devleopment impacts upon the immediate setting of a listed building, the less than substantial harm identified in relation to the existing building and wider Conservation Area is considered to affect the setting of the Grade II listed building to the south of the site. The unsympathetically designed development is concluded to affect the setting of the listed building in addition to the setting of the Conservation Area.

For these reasons, the development fails to comply with Policies LP24 and LP35 of the Kirklees Local Plan policies within Chapter 12 and 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework and the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

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 developments 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 designs principles which will need to be considered when assessing a developments 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."*

In respect of Policies KDP5 and KDP6, the development does not introduce any additional built form, as it involves the partial removal of the existing elevation to accommodate the Juliet balcony. As such, there is no increase in massing or projection that gives rise to overshadowing or loss of outlook to

neighbouring properties. The development is therefore considered acceptable in this regard.

With regard to overlooking and privacy, the development is considered to have the most impact upon 1 Water Street. This property lies to the south of the application site and is positioned directly opposite the proposed Juliet balcony, resulting in a clear and direct relationship between the two.

A submitted floor plan illustrates the separation distances between the Juliet balcony and neighbouring windows at Nos. 1 and 2 Water Street. This indicates that the development achieves a minimum separation distance of approximately 7.9m to 8.3m, increasing to a maximum of 12.9m to more offset windows. These distances fall significantly below the standards set out in the Council's Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document, which recommends a minimum separation distance of 21m between windows serving habitable rooms. Where developments fail to meet this standard, robust justification is required.

The Juliet balcony serves a kitchen/dining space. Based on available floor plans, the directly opposing windows at No.1 Water Street serve a ground floor living/dining room and two first-floor bedrooms. These are all habitable rooms, with at least one of the first-floor bedrooms relying on the front elevation windows as its primary source of outlook.

The SPD acknowledges that separation distances should be considered alongside site-specific factors, including the character of the area, local context, and topography. In this case, there is a notable difference in land levels between the application site and No.1 Water Street. The first-floor windows of No.1 are elevated approximately 2.9m above external ground level, while the Juliet balcony sits at an approximate height of 5.5m.

The supporting planning document seeks to justify the development on this basis, stating: *"It could be argued that this level difference significantly improves the privacy and amenity of all interested parties. It's apparent from the above site section and the in person site survey that the occupants within 2 Co-op Lane are only visible when stood within the later third of the 35.31m² Kitchen Dining Space. Therefore it could be argued that because of the apparent and substantial level difference the new sliding doors have less of an impact on privacy and amenity."*

However, officers consider that the information submitted does not sufficiently demonstrate that the level difference mitigates overlooking to an acceptable degree. The elevated position of the Juliet balcony enables clear and direct views into the windows of No.1 Water Street, particularly those at first-floor level serving bedrooms. Given the relatively short separation distances, the relationship results in an unacceptable loss of privacy for occupants.

Furthermore the size of the opening, Juliet balcony design and fact that it is to serve a large openable doorway encourages activity / its use particularly when the door is open. The main emphasis for openings in no.2 is to the front and

rear, with the only opening in the side being a ground level vehicular access door, as such the development introduces overlooking where there has been none. The established situation for provision of light and outlook at no.2. The established openings are considered to provide adequate light levels and justification for the development on the basis of improved light levels / outlook is not considered to outweigh the identified harm to the residential amenity of neighbouring occupiers.

In addition, the ~2.9m difference in land levels is not considered sufficient to overcome this harm. Instead, the elevated vantage point allows users of the Juliet balcony to look down into the neighbouring windows, resulting in a harmful perception of overlooking for occupants of No.1. Whilst some of the windows are at oblique angles and varying heights in relation to the development the nature of the proposal being to serve a balcony would mean an increased usage and has the potential for a greater degree of overlooking to arise to occupiers of no.1 and no.2.

The development therefore results in direct overlooking of the north-facing windows of No.1 and No.2 Water Street at a separation distance of as little as 8.3 - 8.5m to these dwellings. This is materially below the recommended standards and gives rise to a harmful impact on residential amenity, contrary to the aims of Policies KDP3 and KDP4 of the Extensions SPD. This is contrary to Policies LP24c and Chapter 12 of the NPPF, which seek to protect the amenity of future and neighbouring occupiers.

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 development does not increase the number of bedrooms on site, and it is considered the number of occupants within the dwelling remains as existing. With this being the case, proposed parking arrangements are considered to be acceptable.

The development does not propose any changes highway access. It is therefore considered that the development 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 complies with Key Design Principle 16 of the SPD.

It is therefore considered that in terms of access and highway safety / parking the development complies 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 developments 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 developments protect Habitats and Species of Principal Importance. The site is located within a bat alert layer on the Council's GIS system, however there are no records of bat roosting at the site. Therefore given the scale of the works proposed, officers are satisfied the development does not lead to a harmful impact upon the bat population.

Climate Change

Policy 12 of the Holme Valley Neighbourhood Development Plan seeks to ensure that energy efficient designs are used in all new buildings.

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 development, it is considered that the development does 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 comments of the parish council are noted and addressed in earlier sections of the 'Assessment' section 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.

The Juliet balcony, by reason of its prominence, scale and design, forms an incongruous addition to the host dwelling, having a harmful impact upon the visual amenities of the host property, wider locality and the character of the Hinchliffe Mill Conservation Area as well as the setting of the listed building to the south of the site. The development leads to less than substantial harm for which no public benefit has been demonstrated or are considered to exist more generally to outweigh the identified harm. The development is therefore contrary to the Council's duties under the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, Policies LP24 and LP35 of the Kirklees Local Plan, Policies 1 and 2 of the Holme Valley Neighbourhood Development Plan, principles within the Councils House Extensions and Alterations SPD and policies within Chapters 12 and 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

In addition, the development leads to an unacceptable level of overlooking to no1 and no.2 Water Street to the south of the site to the detriment of the residential amenity of the occupants of those properties. The development is therefore contrary to Policy LP24(b) of the Kirklees Local Plan, Key Design Principles 3 and 4 in the Council's House Extensions and Alterations SPD, policy 2 of the Holme Valley Neighbourhood Development Plan and Policy within Chapter 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

This application has been assessed against relevant policies in the development plan and other material considerations. It is considered that the development does not constitute sustainable development and is therefore recommended for refusal.

Recommendation **REFUSE**

Decision Authorisation - Delegated Powers

Application Number: 2026/90022

Officer Recommendation: Refuse

Reasons:

1. The development, by reason of its prominence, scale and design, forms an incongruous addition to the host dwelling, out of character with the host property and wider locality which has a harmful impact upon the visual amenities of the host property, wider locality and the character of the Hinchliffe Mill Conservation Area as well as the setting of the listed building to the south of the site. The development leads to less than substantial harm for which no public benefit(s) are

demonstrated, or are considered to exist more generally, to outweigh the identified harm. The development is therefore contrary to the Council's duties under the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, policies LP24 and LP35 of the Kirklees Local Plan, policies 1 and 2 of the Holme Valley Neighbourhood Development Plan, principles within the Councils House Extensions and Alterations SPD and policies within Chapters 12 and 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

2. The development leads to an unacceptable level of overlooking to no1 and no.2 Water Street to the south of the site to the detriment of the residential amenity of the occupants of those properties. The development is therefore contrary to Policy LP24(b) of the Kirklees Local Plan, Key Design Principles 3 and 4 in the Council's House Extensions and Alterations SPD, policy 2 of the Holme Valley Neighbourhood Development Plan and Policy within Chapter 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Plans and specifications schedule:-

Plan Type	**Reference**	**Version**	**Date Received**
Location Plan	PP-14587505v1	-	06/01/2026
Existing Site Plan	90-002	-	12/01/2026
Existing Plans and Elevations	20-001	-	12/01/2026
Proposed Site Plan	90-003	-	12/01/2026
Proposed Plans and Elevations	20-002	-	12/01/2026
Proposed Site Section	21-001	-	12/01/2026
Supplementary Design Document	-	-	06/01/2026
Climate Change Statement	-	-	12/01/2026
Cover Letter dated 9 January 2026	-	-	
Application form	-	-	06/01/2026

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 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 requested during the processing of this application, as it was considered they would not overcome the harm caused by the development.