

**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:	2026/62/90463/E
Site Address:	20, North Street, Heckmondwike, WF16 0AY
Description:	Erection of front and rear extensions
Recommending Officer:	Jennifer Booth

DECISION - REFUSED

I hereby authorise the refusal of this application for the reasons set out in the officer's report and recommendation annexed below in respect of the above matter.

Emma Thompson

AUTHORISED OFFICER

Date: 16-Apr-2026

OFFICER REPORT

Site Description

20 North Street is a modern, end terraced property. The dwelling is constructed from artificial stone walls and a tiled roof. The property has white UPVC windows and doors. The application dwelling is accessed from North Street.

To the rear of the site are steps leading down to a wooden patio, which is surrounded by grass and shrubs. To the end of the garden is a small garden shed.

The site is within a wholly residential area with detached and semi-detached dwellings to the North West and south west to the application dwelling. Adjacent to the application dwelling are streets of terraced dwellings.

Description of Proposal

The applicant is seeking permission for a single storey front extension and a single & two storey rear extension, raised terrace to the rear and rear dormer.

The front extension is proposed to project 2.2m from the original front wall, extending across the width of the property with a lean to roof form.

The rear extension would project 6m on the ground floor reducing to 3m at first floor and extending across the width of the dwelling with a flat roof form over the ground floor element and flat roof over the first floor.

The rear dormer would have a width of 6m and a height of 3m with a flat roof form. The dormer would be clad with vertically hung tiles.

The raised terrace would project an additional 3m with a 1m high glazed balustrade

The walls would be constructed using stone with tiles for the roof covering.

The plans also show the enlargement of the parking area.

Relevant Planning History

2015/92888 – Erection of single storey front and two storey rear extension – approved

2016/91172 - Erection of single storey front extension and two storey side and rear extension – approved

2025/91860 – larger home notification – agreed

2025/91863 – erection of single storey front and single & two storey rear extension - approved

History of negotiations

Kirklees Development Management Charter together with the National Planning Policy Framework and the DMPO 2024 encourages negotiation/engagement between Local Planning Authorities and agents/applicants, this is only within the scope of the application under consideration. The proposals plans raise concerns in terms of the design of the first floor rear extension and dormer, with the use of a large flat roof form together with the impact of the proposed balcony. Amended plans have not been sought. There is a fall back of the previous approval which is the maximum that would be supported.

Representations

The application was advertised by site notice, which expired on 13/04/2026

As a result of the above publicity, no representations have been received.

Consultation Responses

None

Policy

Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires that planning applications are determined in accordance with the Development Plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The statutory Development Plan for Kirklees is the Local Plan (adopted 27th February 2019).

The site is UNALLOCATED on the Kirklees Local Plan Proposals Map

On 12th November 2019, the Council adopted a target for achieving 'net zero' carbon emissions by 2038, with an accompanying carbon budget set by the Tyndall Centre for Climate Change Research. National Planning Policy includes a requirement to promote carbon reduction and enhance resilience to climate change through the planning system and these principles have been incorporated into the formulation of Local Plan policies. The Local Plan predates the declaration of a climate emergency and the net zero carbon target; however, it includes a series of policies which are used to assess the suitability of planning applications in the context of climate change. When determining planning applications, the Council will use the relevant Local Plan policies and guidance documents to embed the climate change agenda.

Kirklees Local Plan Policies

- **LP 1** – Achieving sustainable development
- **LP 2** – Place shaping
- **LP 22** – Parking
- **LP 24** - Design

Kirklees Council adopted supplementary planning guidance on house extensions on 29th June 2021 which now carries full weight in decision making. This guidance indicates how the Council will usually interpret its policies regarding such built development, although the general thrust of the advice is aligned with both the Kirklees Local Plan (KLP) and the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), requiring development to be considerate in terms of the character of the host property and the wider street scene. As such, it is anticipated that this SPD will assist with ensuring enhanced consistency in both approach and outcomes relating to house extensions.

National Policies and Guidance:

National planning policy and guidance is set out in National Policy Statements, primarily the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) published December 2024, and the Planning Practice Guidance Suite (PPGS) first launched 6th March 2014 together with Circulars, Ministerial Statements and associated technical guidance.

The NPPF constitutes guidance for local planning authorities and is a material consideration in determining applications.

- Chapter 12 – Achieving well-designed places
- Chapter 14 – Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change

Assessment

Principle of development:

The site is without notation on the Kirklees Local Plan (KLP). Policy LP1 of the KLP states that when considering development proposals, the Council will take a positive approach that reflects the presumption in favour of sustainable development contained in the NPPF. In terms of extending and making alterations to a property, Policy LP24 of the KLP is relevant, in conjunction with the House Extensions & Alterations SPD and Chapter 12 of the NPPF, regarding design. In this case, the principle of development is considered acceptable, and the proposal shall now be assessed against all other material planning considerations, including visual and residential amenity, as well as highway safety.

Impact on visual amenity:

Key Design Principle 1 of the House Extensions & Alterations SPD does state that extensions and alterations to residential properties should be in keeping

with the appearance, scale, design and local character of the area and the street scene. Furthermore, Key Design Principle 2 of the House Extensions & Alterations SPD goes on to state that extensions should not dominate or be larger than the original house and should be in keeping with the existing building in terms of scale, materials and details.

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

Single storey front extension

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

The front extension is set back from the highway and would be modest in terms of its size, continuing the existing line of the dwelling and infilling the corner. The materials proposed would match the main house. The front extension is therefore considered to be acceptable in terms of visual amenity.

Single & two storey rear extension

Paragraphs 5.1 and 5.2 of the House Extensions & Alterations SPD go into further specific detail regarding rear extensions requiring development to maintain the quality of the residential environment, respect the original house and use appropriate materials.

The ground floor of the rear extension has already been agreed through the larger home notification scheme. The proposed first-floor extension, by virtue of its excessive height, flat-roofed form, unsympathetic proportions, and limited regard for the established architectural character of the host dwelling, would appear as an incongruous and visually discordant addition. The increased height exacerbates its prominence, resulting in an overly dominant feature that fails to respond positively to the prevailing roofscape and vertical emphasis typical of properties in the area. As such, the development would be visible from surrounding areas and would cause harm to the visual amenity of both the host property and the wider area.

Rear balcony

The proposed rear balcony, formed as an elevated platform on brick plinths, would introduce an additional built and visually prominent element to the rear elevation. When considered in isolation, the scale and form of the balcony may be regarded as acceptable in visual amenity terms. However, when assessed cumulatively alongside the proposed single-storey and two-storey rear extensions, the development would result in an awkward and overly complex rear arrangement. The combined bulk, layering and projecting

elements would appear visually discordant and unbalanced, to the detriment of the host dwelling's appearance, failing to achieve a coherent or well-integrated design when viewed from the rear.

Rear dormer

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

The proposed rear dormer, when considered in isolation, could potentially be supported in terms of scale and visual impact. However, when assessed in conjunction with the proposed first-floor rear extension with its flat roof form, the overall design results in an awkward and disjointed arrangement. The combination of competing roof forms and massing creates a visually incongruous composition that lacks coherence and architectural harmony, resulting in poor quality design that fails to integrate successfully with the existing dwelling.

Enlargement of parking area

The plans also show the formation of three parking spaces to the front. Whilst paragraph 4.43 of the SPD recommends that parking areas should be softened with landscaping, a number of the property in the row have already enlarged their parking areas. As such, the enlargement proposed would not be out of character.

Having taken the above into account, the proposals 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 (a) in terms of the form, scale and layout and (c) as the extension would form a subservient addition to the property in keeping with the existing building, KDP 1 & 2 of the House Extensions & Alterations SPD and the aims of chapter 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Impact on residential amenity:

Consideration in relation to the impact on the residential amenity of neighbouring occupants shall now be set out, taking into account policy LP24 c), which sets out that proposals should promote good design by, amongst other things, extensions minimising impact on residential amenity of future and neighbouring occupiers. The House Extensions & Alterations SPD goes into further detail with respect to Key Design Principle 3 on privacy, Key Design Principle 5 on overshadowing/loss of light and Key Design Principle 6 on preventing overbearing impact.

Whilst it is noted there is private amenity space adjoining the rear garden of 20, there are no properties directly to the rear which could be affected by the works proposed. The neighbouring garden space is adequate distance to remain unaffected.

Impact on 18a North Street

The limited scale of the front extension is such that there would be no overlooking, overshadowing or overbearing.

The ground floor element has been agreed through the larger home notification scheme. There is a 3m gap between the host property and the adjacent neighbour to the north west which minimises the potential for the first floor, with its reduced projection, from resulting in any overshadowing or overbearing. The windows proposed in the rear elevation would look over the applicants own amenity space with limited potential to overlook the neighbouring properties, over and above the existing relationship.

The additional platform balcony to the rear would result in overlooking of the neighbouring property. Although if minded to approve, officers could include a condition requiring screening to mitigate impact.

The rear dormer would be set up within the roof plane with limited potential to result in any additional overlooking, overshadowing or overbearing.

With regards to the impact on the adjacent 18a North Street, the scheme has been considered in terms of KDP3 – privacy, KDP5 – overshadowing and KDP 6 – overbearing impact of the House Extensions & Alterations SPD, policy LP24 of the KLP c) in term of minimising impact on neighbouring occupiers and advice within chapter 12 of the NPPF and the proposals are considered to be acceptable.

Impact on 22 North Street

The limited scale of the front extension is such that there would be no overlooking, overshadowing or overbearing.

Although the rear extension would be constructed up to the shared boundary with the adjoining dwelling, the ground floor has been agreed through the larger home notification scheme. The first floor has a reduced projection and would be adjacent to the bathroom window of the adjoining property. As such, whilst there would be some overshadowing in the late afternoon and limited overbearing, this would be on a non habitable space. The windows proposed in the rear elevation would look onto the applicants own amenity space with limited potential for overlooking the neighbouring property.

The proposed balcony would result in overlooking of the adjoining property as shown on plan. To provide an appropriate level of screening would result in an overbearing and overshadowing impact.

The rear dormer would be set up within the roof plane with limited potential to result in any additional overlooking, overshadowing or overbearing.

With regards to the impact on the adjoining 22 North Street, the scheme has been considered in terms of KDP3 – privacy, KDP5 – overshadowing and KDP 6 – overbearing impact of the House Extensions & Alterations SPD, policy LP24 of the KLP c) in term of minimising impact on neighbouring occupiers and advice within chapter 12 of the NPPF and the proposals are considered to be unacceptable.

Impact on 1 Francis Street

The host property faces towards the side elevation of the dwelling opposite with the road in between. Given the limited scale of the front extension, there would be no impact on the neighbouring property opposite.

With regards to the impact on the neighbouring 1 Francis Street, the scheme has been considered in terms of KDP3 – privacy, KDP5 – overshadowing and KDP 6 – overbearing impact of the House Extensions & Alterations SPD, policy LP24 of the KLP c) in term of minimising impact on neighbouring occupiers and advice within chapter 12 of the NPPF and the proposals are considered to be acceptable.

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

Impact on highway safety:

The proposals will result in some intensification of the domestic use. However, the submitted plans show the enlargement of the parking area to the front of the property to host three parking spaces which is considered to represent a sufficient provision.

Bin storage for the dwelling would not be moved as part of the proposals.

As such the scheme would not represent any additional harm in terms of highway safety and as such complies with Policy LP22 of the Kirklees Local Plan along with Key Design Principles 15 & 16 of the House Extensions & Alterations SPD.

Other matters:

Carbon Budget

The proposal is a small scale domestic development to an existing dwelling. As such, no special measures were required in terms of the planning application with regards to carbon emissions. However, there are controls in terms of Building Regulations which will need to be adhered to as part of the construction process which will require compliance with national standards.

There are no other matters for consideration.

Representations:

None

Negotiations:

None

Proposed conditions

None as the recommendation is for refusal.

Conclusion:

This application to erect a single storey extension to the front and a single & two storey rear extension with an additional balcony and rear dormer at 20 North Street has been assessed against relevant policies in the development plan as listed in the policy section of the report, the House Extensions & Alterations SPD, the National Planning Policy Framework and other material considerations.

The proposed first-floor rear extension, by reason of its flat-roofed form, would appear visually incongruous and unsympathetic to the host dwelling. The flat roof fails to reflect the architectural character and roof form of the existing property, resulting in a dominant and unbalanced addition when viewed from the rear. As such, the extension would detract from the appearance of the dwelling and represents poor quality design, contrary Policy LP24 of the Kirklees Local Plan, KDP1 & KDP 2 of the House Extensions & Alterations SPD and Chapter 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

The proposed rear dormer, when considered in combination with the proposed first-floor rear extension with its flat roof form, would result in an awkward and incongruous composition. The cumulative impact of the competing roof forms, massing and alignment would create a visually discordant and poorly integrated rear elevation, detracting from the architectural coherence and appearance of the host dwelling. As such, the development represents poor quality design and fails to preserve the visual amenities of the property, contrary to Policy LP24 of the Kirklees Local Plan, KDP1 & KDP 2 of the House Extensions & Alterations SPD and Chapter 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

The proposal balcony would result in unacceptable overlooking of the adjoining property and cannot be sufficiently mitigated without resulting in additional overshadowing and overbearing. To permit the proposals would be contrary to Policy LP24 of the Kirklees Local Plan, KDP5 & KDP6 of the House Extensions & Alterations SPD and Chapter 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework,

The NPPF has introduced a presumption in favour of sustainable development. The policies set out in the NPPF taken as a whole constitute the Government's view of what sustainable development means in practice.

This application has been assessed against relevant policies in the development plan and other material considerations. For the reasons set out above it is considered that the development would not constitute sustainable development and is therefore recommended for refusal.

Recommendation

Refuse

Decision Authorisation - Delegated Powers

Application Number: 2026/90463

Officer Recommendation: Refuse

Reasons for refusal

1. The proposed first-floor rear extension, by reason of its flat-roofed form, would appear visually incongruous and unsympathetic to the host dwelling. The flat roof fails to reflect the architectural character and roof form of the existing property, resulting in a dominant and unbalanced addition when viewed from the rear. As such, the extension would detract from the appearance of the dwelling and represents poor quality design, contrary Policy LP24 of the Kirklees Local Plan, KDP1 & KDP 2 of the House Extensions & Alterations SPD and Chapter 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework.
1. The proposed rear dormer, when considered in combination with the proposed first-floor rear extension with its flat roof form, would result in poor design and incongruous arrangement. The cumulative impact of the competing roof forms, massing and alignment would create a visually discordant and poorly integrated rear elevation, detracting from the architectural coherence and appearance of the host dwelling. As such, the development represents poor quality design detracting from visual amenity of the property and area, contrary to Policy LP24 of the Kirklees Local Plan, KDP1 & KDP 2 of the House Extensions & Alterations SPD and Chapter 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework.
2. The proposal balcony would result in unacceptable overlooking of the adjoining property and cannot be sufficiently mitigated without resulting in additional overshadowing and overbearing to the detriment of the adjoining occupants. To permit the proposals would be contrary to Policy LP24 of the Kirklees Local Plan, KDP5 & KDP6 of the House Extensions & Alterations SPD and Chapter 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Plans and specifications schedule: -

Plan Type	Reference	Web ID	Date Received
Location plan	-	1127417	19/02/2026
Existing plans	2629-1	1127418	19/02/2026
Proposed plans	2629-2	1127419	19/02/2026
Climate change statement	-	1127422	19/02/2026

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 proposals plans raise concerns in terms of the design of the first floor rear extension and dormer, with the use of a large flat roof form together with the impact of the proposed balcony. Amended plans have not been sought. There is a fall back of the previous approval which is the maximum that would be supported.

Report Dated

14/04/2026