

Robert Halstead

Chartered Surveyors & Town Planners

N.C. Willock MRICS MRTPI

Office G of H, Bridge Mills, Huddersfield Road, Holmfirth, HD9 3TW

Tel: 01484 686322 e mail: nick@roberthalstead.co.uk

Planning Development

Planning Statement – Section 73 application to vary plans for raising of roof and two storey extension of previous permission ref: 2025/93129

395 Manchester Road, Marsden, Huddersfield, HD7 6DP

Introduction

In October 2024, planning permission was approved for “raising of roof height and erection of rear dormer with associated alterations” (ref: 2024/92127). This was followed in September 2025 with a Certificate of Lawfulness for “Proposed erection of single storey rear extension and rear dormer” (ref: 2025/91575).

As an alternative scheme to the fallback position established by the first two consents, planning permission was then approved in January this year for “raising of roof height, demolition of existing rear lean-to extension and erection of two storey rear extension with associated alterations” (ref: 2025/62/93129/W).

To date, none of these proposals have been implemented.

This new application seeks to vary Condition 2 of the most recent planning permission for “raising the roof height, demolition of rear lean-to and erection of two-storey rear extension”, and proposes to extend the first floor element of the rear extension by 0.5m, to match the approved ground floor projection of 3.5m.

Site Description

The property is a single storey detached bungalow with a hipped roof situated within a semi-rural location. The exterior of the bungalow has been constructed of stone and render with a blue slate roof. The property is set back from Manchester Road and is in an elevated position. There is currently a small single storey timber lean-to extension at the rear of the dwelling. The property has a good-sized rear garden. Vehicular access to the property is via a track at the rear of the site beyond which are open fields and countryside. The immediate neighbouring properties also comprise of detached bungalows.

Planning History

2024/92127 – Raising of roof height and erection of rear dormer with associated alterations – Approved

2025/91575 – Certificate of lawfulness for proposed erection of single storey rear extension and rear dormer – Approved

2025/93129 – Planning application for raising of roof height, demolition of existing rear lean-to extension and erection of two storey rear extension with associated alterations – Approved

Policy Designation

The application site is located within the Green Belt in accordance with the Kirklees Local Plan. The site is also within the Strategic Green Infrastructure Network.



Rear elevation of 395 Manchester Road

The Proposals

This application seeks planning permission for a variation of Condition 2 on the previous planning permission ref: 2025/93129 for ‘raising the roof height, demolition of rear lean-to and erection of two-storey rear extension.’

As with the previous planning permission, the existing roof and chimney are proposed to be removed. The external walls of the bungalow would be built up, and a new roof would be constructed. The increase in the height of the dwelling would be 0.6m. The new raised external walling would be constructed of concrete blocks and rendered, and the new roof would be tiled in blue slates.

The proposed two-storey rear extension would project out from the existing rear elevation by 3.5m at both ground and first floor level (and increase in 0.5m at first floor level) and would form a gable end on the rear of the property. As with the previous proposals granted planning permission, the extension

would provide additional living accommodation on the ground floor with an additional bedroom with en-suite on the first floor. The extension would be constructed using matching materials (concrete block and render, coursed stone with a blue slate roof). Window/door openings are proposed on the rear and east side elevations with rooflights proposed on the front and side facing roof slopes.

The purposes of the additional 0.5m projection at first floor level are twofold:

- (i) This will eliminate the need for a costly design solution to building a rear will be two different levels of rear projection; and
- (ii) Given the restrictions in head height given this will be a 'room in the roof', the extra 0.5m will disproportionately benefit the amount of space available for the occupants of the bedroom in question, by enabling an internal width of 3.4 metres for the proposed master bedroom instead of only 2.9m.

Assessment of the Proposals

Green Belt Impact

Paragraph 154 in the NPPF states:

'Development in the Green Belt is inappropriate unless one of the following exceptions applies:

c) the extension or alteration of a building provided that it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building.'

The relevant parts of Local Plan Policy LP57 also state,

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

a. in the case of extensions, the original building remains the dominant element both in terms of size and overall appearance. The cumulative impact of previous extensions and of other associated buildings will be taken into account. Proposals to extend buildings which have already been extended should have regard to the scale and character of the original part of the building;

d. the design and materials should have regard to relevant design policies to ensure that the resultant development does not materially detract from its Green Belt setting.'

The most recent planning application (2025/93129) on this site was supported in connection with Green Belt policy, with the officer's report stating:

The additions to the property in the form of a two storey rear extension and raised roof height would result in a total increase of 37%, which is considered to be proportionate in relation to the existing building, especially considering the bulk of the extension is proposed to the rear of the dwelling, and neighbouring properties have also erected rear extensions in the locality.

Considering this, the additions to the dwelling are subservient and are not considered to depict disproportionate development in the Green Belt.

It is also noted that the site benefits from planning permission under applications: 2024/92127 & 2025/91575 and therefore has a fallback position. The agent has confirmed that if planning consent is granted for this application, the previous two permissions will not be carried out.

The current proposals to extend the first floor element of the rear extension by a further 0.5m to match the ground floor projection of 3.5m, is considered to be acceptable for the following reasons.

- 1) The additional 0.5m is at the rear of the property and as acknowledged in the previous officer's assessment, the rear of the property (also set down significantly from the much higher land to the rear of this row of properties), together with the fact that other properties have extended to the rear, means that the additional 0.5m will not make the extension materially more conspicuous or prominent in relation to Green Belt openness and visual amenity, where the rear extension would be largely inconspicuous.
- 2) In relation to Local Plan Policy LP57 d, the design of both the new roof and the two-storey rear extension is considered to be acceptable and would not detract from the Green Belt setting.
- 3) The walling and roofing materials (concrete, render, coursed stone and blue slates) would match the existing dwelling.
- 4) The fenestration and architectural detailing proposed would also result in a high-quality finish that relates well to the existing dwelling and local environment.

Given the above, the proposals are still considered to allow the original property to remain the dominant element, as per the assessment of the previous case including the fallback position (noting that the first two consents remain extant and are capable of being implemented). As such, the proposals are considered to comply with Local Plan Policy LP57 and Para 154 of the NPPF.

Design and Visual Amenity

Local Plan Policy LP24 states that,

'Proposals should promote good design by ensuring: c. extensions are subservient to the original building, are in keeping with the existing building in terms of scale, materials and details.'

Paragraph 135 in the NPPF also sets out various design objectives, including the need to ensure that developments are visually attractive, sympathetic to local character, and establish or maintain a strong sense of place.

The Kirklees House Extensions and Alterations Supplemental Planning Document (SPD) also sets out what the Council considers to be good, high-quality design through a number of principles. The relevant principles in this application in relation to design and visual amenity are:

Key Design Principle 1: Local character and street scene

Key Design Principle 2: Impact on the original house

Key Design Principle 9: Construction materials

Further guidance regarding two-storey rear extensions is provided in Section 5.8 of the SPD and these points are addressed below.

The applicant's property, like the two neighbouring properties on either side, is a single storey detached bungalow with a hipped roof. It is considered that the slight increase in the height of the roof

(0.6m) would not detract from the existing character and appearance of the property when viewed from the street. As shown on the Proposed Plans, the height of the eaves and the ridge height would continue to relate well to the neighbouring dwellings. Officers also previously considered that the increase to the height of the roof (in the 2024/92127 planning application) “would not lead to visual harm within the street scene.”

The design of the two-storey extension in terms of siting, roof style and architectural detailing would complement the existing dwelling which would remain the dominant element in terms of size and overall appearance. The property also has a relatively large garden which results in the proposed extension being proportionate to the size of the original house and garden combined.

The proposed two-storey extension also accords with the guidance outlined in the SPD in that it would not exceed 50% of the total area of land around the original house; it would project out by less than 4 metres from the existing rear elevation; and the extension would not adversely affect any neighbouring habitable room windows. In addition, the extension would not bring the property any closer to any of the neighbouring dwellings and the eaves height of the extension only just exceeds 3 metres where it faces No. 397 where the gap between the extension and the shared boundary is 0.7 metres.

The Previous case assessment in relation to the impact on the character and appearance of the area (visual amenity), concluded:

The two-storey rear extension is set entirely behind the existing building, not projecting beyond the sides, and is considered to respect the original house and garden in terms of size and scale, not exceeding 50% of the total area of land around the original house. Furthermore, the use of concrete block, render, and coursed stone walls, as well as a blue slate roof is considered acceptable as these materials are to match those used in the existing dwelling.

The proposals are therefore considered to remain acceptable with regard to design and visual amenity and complies with Local Plan Policy LP24, paragraph 135 in the NPPF and Key Design Principles 1, 2 and 9 in the Kirklees House Extensions and Alterations SPD.

Residential Amenity

Local Plan Policy LP24 states:

‘Proposals should promote good design by ensuring: c. extensions minimise impact on residential amenity of future and neighbouring occupiers.’

This is echoed in paragraph 135 f) in the NPPF.

The Kirklees House Extensions and Alterations Supplemental Planning Document (SPD) also sets out what the Council considers to be good, high-quality design through a number of principles. The relevant principles in this application in relation to residential amenity are:

Key Design Principle 3: Privacy

Key Design Principle 4: Habitable rooms and side windows

Key Design Principle 5: Overshadowing/loss of light

Key Design Principle 6: Preventing overbearing impact

Key Design Principle 7: Outdoor space

The closest neighbouring dwellings are No's 393 and 397 Manchester Road which are located on either side of the applicant's property.

Officers previously considered the element relating to the increase of 0.6m to the original roof as acceptable with regards to residential amenity.

The siting of the proposed two-storey extension would project forward of the rear elevation of no. 393. However, only three rooflights are proposed on the east facing roof slope that would face the garden of no. 393.

With regard to relevant potential impacts on no. 397 (to the west):

- 1) No. 397 has already been extended at the rear. The proposed two-storey extension would not project out any further than the neighbouring extension.
- 2) Only one high-level window and two rooflights are proposed on the western elevation of the proposed extension that would face No. 397. Therefore no material overlooking would occur.
- 3) There is a 0.7m difference between the height (as proposed) of the application dwelling and the no. 397 to the west at eaves and ridge height. The fence of no. 397 is also currently higher than the eaves height on the application property. Therefore, the proposed additional 0.5m projection at first floor level, means that there will be no notable loss in light, or impacts on privacy or overshadowing.
- 4) The House Extensions SPD allows up to 4 metres projection for two storey rear extensions on detached properties (Para 5.8). As such, the proposed 3.5m projection is well within these guidelines, and as pointed out above, no. 397 has been extended to the rear already.
- 5) The House Extensions SPD allows up to 3 metres eaves height if within 1.5m of the property boundary (Para 5.8) (the gap between the extension and neighbour's fence on top of the shared wall in this case is 1m). The eaves height of the extension is in fact 2.9m, and this is of course effectively reduced by the 0.7m height difference between the ground levels of numbers 395 and 397. As such, the site in reality, when viewed from 397 would only be 2.2 m high at eaves level . This is well within the SPD guidance parameters.
- 6) The rear extension is also compliant with the other SPD criteria – e.g. proportionate to the size of the original house and garden and not exceeding 50% of the total area of land around the original house (Para 5.8).
- 7) The gardens behind these properties, because they are at a significantly higher level, overshadow all properties in the street, and sunlight mainly rests at the top of the bank in all adjacent gardens for the majority of the year. As such, the additional 0.5m projection at first floor level will not materially impact upon the light received by no. 397 across the seasons, [particularly when combined with the difference in ground level between nos. 395 and 397 highlighted above.

As a result, the proposed development would not cause undue harm to the residential amenity of the occupants of Nos. 393 or 397 by way of outlook, privacy or daylight.

The proposed development is therefore considered to be acceptable in relation to residential amenity and complies with Local Plan Policy LP24 and the relevant Key Design Principles in the House Extensions and Alterations SPD.

Highway Considerations

The proposed development would add one additional bedroom to the property. This was also the case for the previous planning application. In that case, officers considered that, “it would not be necessary to create a parking area as there is a dedicated section for parking for these properties along Manchester Road which hosts a sufficient amount of parking for this development so as not to be detrimental to highways safety.”

Like the previous planning approval, the addition of one bedroom is therefore considered to be acceptable with regard to highway safety and accords with Local Plan Policies LP21 and LP22 and the aims of Chapter 9 in the NPPF.

Ecology – Bats

The previous planning approvals, like the current proposals, sought to alter the roof of the property. Officers previously considered on both recent planning applications ¹ that a Bat Survey was not required and that the proposals are acceptable in respect of bats, and accord with the aims of Chapter 15 in the NPPF.

Climate Change

A Climate Change Statement is submitted as part of the application. Climate change mitigation measures have been incorporated into the proposals. These include:

- High-quality wall and roof insulation
- Materials to be sourced locally
- Installation of energy/water efficient appliances

The proposals would therefore have a small positive impact on climate change in accordance with Local Plan Policies LP24 and LP26.

Summary

This application seeks to vary Condition 2 of the most recent planning permission for “raising the roof height, demolition of rear lean-to and erection of two-storey rear extension”, and proposes to extend the first floor element of the rear extension by 0.5m, to match the approved ground floor projection of 3.5m.

The additional 0.5m projection at first floor level would not in the opinion of the applicant, warrant a change to the previous LPA conclusions regarding design, scale and materials of the extensions, which would still respect the character and appearance of the host dwelling and local context.

With regard to residential amenity, the additional 0.5m projection would remain well within the guidelines set out by relevant House Extensions & Alterations SPD. Further mitigation would also come

¹ 2025/91575 & 2025/93129

through the presence of rear extensions at no. 397, and the ground level difference given the applicant's property is 0.7m lower than that of no. 397.

The additional 0.5m projection at first floor level compared with the previously approved proposals, would not be considered to cause any material additional harm with regard to the residential amenity of no. 397. As such, in our client's respectful opinion, this change would not sufficient to justify refusing planning permission on the balance of all material planning considerations set out above.

We therefore respectfully request that planning permission is granted.

Robert Halstead Chartered Surveyors & Town Planners

April 2026