PLANNING STATEMENT

PROPOSED EXTENSIONS AND ALTERATIONS TO EXISTING DWELLING

EDGEMOOR
59 OLDFIELD ROAD
HONLEY
HOLMFIRTH
HD9 6RP

Applicant: Tom Dyson
Local Planning Authority: Kirklees Council
Existing Drawing: 2025-08-001 Rev A
Proposed Drawing: 2025-08-002 Rev B

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 This Planning Statement has been prepared in support of a householder planning application for the proposed extensions, alterations and improvements to the existing dwelling known as Edgemoor, 59 Oldfield Road, Honley, Holmfirth, HD9 6RP.

1.2 The application seeks planning permission for the enlargement and improvement of the existing family dwelling, including extensions to provide additional ground and first floor accommodation, an integral garage, an open-sided car port, associated roof alterations, replacement external finishes, new and replacement windows and doors, and the installation of roof-integrated photovoltaic solar panels. The submitted proposed plans identify the enlarged ground- and first-floor accommodation together with the garage, car port, roof alterations, proposed external materials and photovoltaic installation.

1.3 The application site lies within the Green Belt. The proposals have therefore been developed and assessed having particular regard to the national Green Belt policies contained within the National Planning Policy Framework (17 August 2026) and Policy LP57 of the adopted Kirklees Local Plan. Chapter 13 of the Framework identifies openness and permanence as the essential features of the Green Belt. National decision-making Policy GB6 establishes the control of development in the Green Belt, while Policy GB7 identifies categories of development which are not inappropriate. Of direct relevance, Policy GB7(1)(b) includes the reuse, extension, alteration or replacement of an existing building, provided that the building is of permanent and substantial construction, is lawful in planning terms, and any extension or alteration would not result in a disproportionate increase in size compared with the original building.

1.4 This Planning Statement therefore considers the proposal in relation to:

- the Green Belt designation of the site;
- the original dwelling and proposed increase in accommodation;
- the scale, massing and three-dimensional form of the proposal;
- the effect upon Green Belt openness;
- Policy LP57 of the Kirklees Local Plan;
- the established residential character of Oldfield Road;
- relevant local development precedent;
- design and external materials;
- residential amenity;
- access and parking;
- landscape character; and
- sustainability and renewable-energy measures.

2.0 SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

2.1 The application property is one half of a two-storey semi-detached pair situated on the eastern side of Oldfield Road, Honley. The adjoining dwelling at No.57 forms the other half of the same original architectural composition and is therefore of particular relevance to the design and contextual assessment of the proposal.

2.2 The property occupies a substantial and elongated residential plot extending eastwards from Oldfield Road. The overall application site extends to approximately 765 m².

2.3 The dwelling is positioned towards the western/front portion of the site, with a substantial private garden extending to the rear. Existing hardstanding and vehicular parking are provided adjacent to Oldfield Road, while the rear and side areas are predominantly laid out as domestic garden.

2.4 The existing dwelling comprises a traditional two-storey residential form beneath a hipped roof. The submitted drawings identify existing concrete roof tiles, Yorkshire stone detailing, pebble-dash render and a mixture of existing window and door treatments.

2.5 For the purposes of the Green Belt assessment, the dwelling illustrated on Drawing 2025-08-001 Rev A represents the original dwelling and there are no previous extensions which require separate inclusion within a cumulative assessment. The dimensioned existing drawing therefore provides a clear baseline against which the proposed enlargement can be considered.

2.6 Oldfield Road has an established residential character comprising dwellings of varying scale, appearance, architectural treatment and external materials. The street does not exhibit a wholly uniform architectural form. Properties have evolved and been altered over time, resulting in variation in building form, extensions, roof arrangements and external finishes. The proposal should therefore be considered within this established and varied residential context.

3.0 GREEN BELT DESIGNATION

3.1 The application site lies within the Green Belt as identified on the adopted Kirklees Local Plan Policies Map. The Green Belt designation has been checked against the Council's adopted Policies Map with the Green Belt layer displayed and compared with the submitted location and site plans.

3.2 The Green Belt designation extends across the application site, including the existing dwelling and the land upon which the proposed extensions and associated works would be constructed. The application is therefore presented on the clear basis that the development is situated within the Green Belt and requires assessment against the relevant Green Belt policies.

3.3 The statutory development plan for the area includes the Kirklees Local Plan, adopted 27 February 2019. Policy LP57 specifically addresses the extension, alteration and replacement of existing buildings within the Green Belt.

3.4 The extract from the adopted Policies Map reproduced below confirms the relationship between the application property and the Green Belt designation.

Figure 1 - Extract from the Kirklees Adopted Local Plan Policies Map showing the application site at 59 Oldfield Road within the designated Green Belt.

4.0 PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT

4.1 The proposal comprises extensions and alterations to the existing dwelling to provide accommodation appropriate to its long-term use as a family home, together with improvements to its external appearance and energy performance.

4.2 The principal components of the development comprise:

- extension of the existing ground-floor accommodation;
- extension of the first-floor accommodation;
- provision of an integral garage;
- provision of an open-sided car port;
- associated roof alterations;
- new and replacement windows and doors;
- replacement external render;
- retention and incorporation of appropriate stone detailing;
- roof-integrated photovoltaic solar panels; and
- associated external and landscaping works.

4.3 The development has been designed as a single coherent architectural composition rather than as a series of visually unrelated additions. The extensions are concentrated immediately around the established dwelling and do not introduce a separate dwelling or substantial detached enclosed building within the extensive rear garden.

4.4 The principal enlarged dwelling retains a conventional domestic appearance and hipped/pitched roof form. The additions therefore relate architecturally to the established house rather than introducing an unrelated form of development.

4.5 The proposed car port has an area of approximately 22 m², with an eaves height of approximately 2.95 m and a ridge height of approximately 4.70 m.

4.6 Importantly, the car port is proposed as an open-sided green-oak framed structure. It should therefore be distinguished from a conventional enclosed garage or domestic extension. Its open construction allows views through the structure and materially reduces its visual solidity and spatial enclosure when compared with a fully enclosed building occupying an equivalent footprint.

5.0 ORIGINAL DWELLING AND QUANTITATIVE ASSESSMENT

5.1 For Green Belt purposes, the appropriate baseline is the original building. Drawing 2025-08-001 Rev A represents the original dwelling and has therefore been adopted as the baseline for the quantitative and qualitative assessment of the proposal.

5.2 For transparency and consistency, the building areas have been calculated on a Gross External Area (GEA) basis, measured to the external face of the building. The same methodology has been applied to the original dwelling and to the proposed additions. These figures provide a clear quantitative comparison of physical building area but are considered alongside footprint, height, massing, built form, elevation area and effect upon Green Belt openness.

5.3 The accurate GEA assessment is as follows:

Element	**Gross External Area**
Original ground floor	55.5 m²
Original first floor	49.5 m²
Original dwelling total	105.0 m²
Proposed ground-floor extension	62.0 m²
of which integral garage	27.5 m²
Proposed first-floor extension	32.0 m²
Total additional enclosed GEA	94.0 m²
Resulting total enclosed GEA	199.0 m²
Increase over original dwelling	89.5%
Open-sided car port	22.0 m²
Overall application site	approximately 765 m²

5.4 The proposal therefore introduces approximately 94.0 m² of additional enclosed GEA when compared with the 105.0 m² original dwelling, representing an overall increase of approximately 89.5%. The extent of the enlargement is acknowledged and forms an important part of the Green Belt assessment.

5.5 Approximately 27.5 m² of the ground-floor extension comprises an integral garage located within the two-storey side extension. Excluding the garage for descriptive purposes only, the additional non-garage GEA is approximately 66.5 m², equivalent to approximately 63.3% of the original dwelling. The garage is not excluded from the Green Belt assessment; the breakdown is provided simply to explain the nature and function of the additional building area.

5.6 Neither the National Planning Policy Framework nor Policy LP57 establishes a fixed numerical percentage beyond which an extension automatically becomes disproportionate. The approximately 89.5% increase is therefore an important quantitative consideration, but the assessment must also consider the resulting three-dimensional form, height, bulk, massing, architectural relationship with the original dwelling, the immediate built context and the spatial and visual effect upon openness.

5.7 The 22.0 m² car port is identified separately because it is an open-sided structure rather than enclosed internal accommodation. Its physical presence is nevertheless acknowledged and assessed as part of the overall development.

6.0 THREE-DIMENSIONAL FORM, HEIGHT AND MASSING

6.1 The GEA calculation does not, in isolation, describe the resulting three-dimensional scale or visual mass of the development. This is particularly relevant because the additional accommodation is distributed between a two-storey side extension and a substantially lower single-storey rear extension rather than forming a uniform two-storey enlargement.

6.2 The two-storey side extension continues the established principal vertical parameters of the dwelling. The existing and proposed principal eaves height is approximately 5.23 metres and the existing and proposed principal ridge height is approximately 7.90 metres. Existing floor levels continue through the proposed accommodation. The proposal therefore extends the established two-storey form laterally without increasing its principal overall height.

6.3 The integral garage, comprising approximately 27.5 m², is contained at ground-floor level within this two-storey side extension. It does not form a detached or freestanding building within the curtilage.

6.4 The full-length single-storey rear extension is deliberately subordinate in height. It is formed beneath a mono-pitched lean-to roof with an eaves height of approximately 2.60 metres and a ridge height of approximately 3.48 metres. The lower roof profile materially limits its visual bulk compared with an equivalent two-storey extension.

6.5 Only 32.0 m² of the 94.0 m² additional GEA occurs at first-floor level. A GEA calculation necessarily gives the same numerical weight to a square metre of low-level single-storey accommodation as to a square metre of first-floor accommodation, notwithstanding their materially different consequences for bulk, massing and visual effect. The 89.5% GEA increase should therefore be read alongside the actual distribution and form of the development.

6.6 A comparative assessment of the principal elevation areas has also been undertaken. The existing front and rear elevations each measure approximately 46.6 m² and increase to approximately 74.9 m² as proposed, an increase of approximately 60.7%. The existing side elevations each measure approximately 55.0 m² and increase to approximately 63.2 m², an increase of approximately 14.9%.

6.7 Collectively, the four principal elevation areas increase from approximately 203.2 m² to 276.2 m², an increase of approximately 35.9%. This figure is not presented as a building-volume calculation or as a substitute for the GEA assessment. It is an additional quantitative indication of the change in the external envelope and demonstrates that the 89.5% increase in GEA does not translate directly into an equivalent increase in apparent elevational scale.

6.8 The combination of unchanged principal ridge and eaves heights, the limited first-floor addition, the low mono-pitched rear element and the comparatively smaller increase in the combined elevation envelope is therefore relevant to the planning judgement concerning scale, bulk, massing and the continued visual relationship between the original and extended dwelling.

7.0 NATIONAL PLANNING POLICY FRAMEWORK – GREEN BELT

7.1 The application site lies within the Green Belt. The National Planning Policy Framework published on 17 August 2026 introduces national decision-making Policies GB6 and GB7 for development in the Green Belt. Policy GB6(1) states that development in the Green Belt is inappropriate unless it falls within one of the categories in Policy GB7. Policy GB7(1)(b) provides that the reuse, extension, alteration or replacement of an existing building is not inappropriate where the existing building is of permanent and substantial construction, is lawful in planning terms, and any extension or alteration would not result in a disproportionate increase in size compared with the original building. Footnote 40 defines the original building as the building that existed on 1 July 1948 or, if constructed after that date, as it was built originally.

7.2 The Framework does not prescribe a fixed percentage or a single mathematical method for determining whether an increase in size is disproportionate. The assessment is therefore a matter of planning judgement informed by the scale and physical consequences of the development. Where development does not satisfy Policy GB7 and is therefore inappropriate, Policy GB6(2) requires any resulting Green Belt harm, including harm to openness, to be given substantial weight.

7.3 In this case, the 89.5% GEA increase is expressly acknowledged. It is not advanced as a modest numerical enlargement. However, the proposal should also be assessed having regard to its unchanged principal height, the distribution of additional accommodation, the substantially lower rear lean-to element, the resulting elevation envelope, its architectural composition and its actual effect upon openness.

7.4 The proposal remains an extension and alteration of the existing family dwelling. It does not create a separate dwelling, subdivide the residential planning unit or introduce a detached residential building within the substantial rear garden.

8.0 KIRKLEES LOCAL PLAN POLICY LP57

8.1 Policy LP57 of the adopted Kirklees Local Plan is directly relevant to extensions and alterations to buildings in the Green Belt. Of particular relevance is the requirement that the original building remains the dominant element both in terms of size and overall appearance, with the cumulative effect of previous extensions and associated buildings taken into account.

8.2 Drawing 2025-08-001 Rev A represents the original dwelling and there are no previous extensions at No.59 requiring inclusion in a cumulative assessment. This provides a clear original-building baseline.

8.3 The proposed increase in GEA should be considered alongside the resulting form and appearance of the dwelling. Policy LP57 requires consideration of both size and overall appearance. In this case, the two-storey side extension maintains the established principal eaves and ridge heights and continues the architectural form of the existing dwelling, reflecting the corresponding approved extension at No.57.

8.4 The single-storey rear extension is considerably lower than the principal house and is contained beneath a 2.60 m eaves / 3.48 m ridge mono-pitched roof. Its low form limits the extent to which additional ground-floor area translates into additional visual mass.

8.5 The proposal should therefore be assessed against LP57 through a balanced consideration of GEA, resulting built form, height, massing, relationship with the original dwelling, immediate built context and effect upon Green Belt openness rather than through floor-area arithmetic alone.

9.0 CENTRAL DESIGN RATIONALE - RELATIONSHIP WITH NO.57 AND RESTORATION OF THE SEMI-DETACHED PAIR

9.1 Particular weight should be given to the relationship between No.59 and the adjoining No.57 Oldfield Road. No.57 forms the other half of the same semi-detached pair and is therefore not simply a neighbouring property or a general example of development elsewhere on Oldfield Road. It forms part of the same original architectural composition as the application dwelling and is the closest and most directly comparable built context.

9.2 Planning permission reference 2017/62/90385/W approved a two-storey side extension and a single-storey rear extension to No.57. The approved floor plans and elevations for that development have been considered directly in the preparation of the present proposal and provide the principal architectural reference for the extensions proposed at No.59.

9.3 Importantly, the applicant has checked the proposed dimensions against the approved development at No.57 and confirms that the proposed two-storey side extension and the proposed single-storey rear extension at No.59 are exactly the same dimensions as the corresponding approved extensions at No.57. The scale selected for the proposal is therefore not arbitrary: it is derived directly from the approved extension form of the physically attached half of the same semi-detached building.

9.4 The proposed two-storey side extension consequently mirrors the corresponding extension at No.57 in dimensions, scale, height, roof form and architectural proportions. The principal eaves and ridge levels remain at approximately 5.23 m and 7.90 m respectively, so the proposal does not increase the established principal height of the building. When the pair is viewed together, the matching side additions provide corresponding forms to either side of the original semi-detached composition.

9.5 The same design principle applies to the single-storey rear extension. It is exactly the same dimensions as the corresponding approved rear extension at No.57 and has a mono-pitched lean-to roof with eaves at approximately 2.60 m and ridge at approximately 3.48 m. The matching dimensions and aligned roof levels allow the rear additions to read as a continuous and coordinated architectural element across the semi-detached pair.

9.6 This relationship is a central part of the planning and design case. The proposal has not been designed by considering No.59 as an isolated dwelling. Instead, it responds to the architecture of the semi-detached building as a whole. Repeating the dimensions and form already approved to the adjoining half would restore a substantially more balanced and symmetrical composition, with corresponding two-storey side additions and coordinated single-storey rear additions.

9.7 The relationship with No.57 is particularly relevant to the assessment of overall appearance under Policy LP57. Although the quantitative increase in GEA at No.59 is acknowledged, the resulting development would not present as an arbitrary or unrelated enlargement. Its dimensions, roof form and proportions are deliberately tied to the approved extension form of the adjoining half of the same building. This provides a clear, site-specific architectural rationale for the proposed scale and materially informs the judgement of how the enlarged dwelling would actually appear in its immediate context.

9.8 The applicant does not suggest that permission 2017/62/90385/W automatically determines the Green Belt acceptability of the present application. No.59 must be assessed independently against the current National Planning Policy Framework and Policy LP57. Nevertheless, the approved development at No.57 is materially relevant to the assessment of design, scale and overall appearance because it relates to the physically attached half of the same semi-detached building. The exact dimensional match provides a particularly strong contextual basis for the design now proposed. This approach is also consistent with NPPF Policy DP3(1), which requires development proposals to respond to the history,

character and features of their site and setting so that they integrate with and enhance their surroundings.

10.0 EFFECT UPON GREEN BELT OPENNESS

10.1 The proposal necessarily increases the footprint and amount of built development and that effect is acknowledged. The relevant consideration is the degree and nature of that effect within the particular circumstances of the site, including the form and distribution of the additions and their relationship with the established semi-detached pair.

10.2 The property occupies an established residential curtilage of approximately 765 m². The extensions are concentrated around the existing dwelling at the Oldfield Road end of the plot rather than dispersing new built development along the substantial depth of the rear garden.

10.3 A substantial proportion of the rear garden therefore remains open and undeveloped, maintaining the established pattern of a dwelling positioned towards Oldfield Road with an elongated garden extending behind.

10.4 The principal two-storey extension does not increase the existing ridge or eaves height, while the rear extension is substantially lower at 2.60 m to eaves and 3.48 m to ridge. These characteristics moderate the visual and spatial effect of the additional accommodation.

10.5 The 22 m² car port forms part of the overall openness assessment. Although its footprint is acknowledged, its open-sided green-oak construction provides visual permeability and materially less enclosure than an equivalent fully enclosed garage or extension.

10.6 Existing vegetation and boundary planting provide additional landscape containment. Taken together with the concentration of development around the established house, retention of the long rear garden and absence of a separate dwelling or detached enclosed residential building, these factors moderate the effect upon openness.

11.0 DESIGN AND VISUAL APPEARANCE

11.1 The proposed extensions and alterations have been designed to integrate with the existing dwelling and complement the adjoining property at No.57. The established roof forms, domestic character and coordinated palette of materials are carried through the design.

11.2 A central design objective is to restore the relationship between No.59 and adjoining No.57. Both proposed extensions at No.59 are exactly the same dimensions as their corresponding approved extensions at No.57. The mirrored two-storey side form and matching, aligned single-storey rear extension therefore create a deliberately balanced composition and respond directly to the approved and established form of the attached dwelling.

11.3 The proposed roof forms avoid an increase in the principal ridge line.

11.4 Grey aluminium windows and doors, stone heads and cills, matching concrete roof tiles and coordinated rainwater goods provide a consistent architectural treatment.

12.0 REPLACEMENT OF EXISTING PEBBLE-DASH RENDER

12.1 Drawing 2025-08-001 Rev A identifies pebble-dash render as an existing external material. It is proposed to replace this with a high-quality smooth-finished through-coloured render in a restrained neutral off-white/cream colour.

12.2 The proposed treatment responds positively to the adjoining property and other rendered properties along Oldfield Road. It will rationalise the appearance of the original dwelling and proposed extensions and strengthen the visual coherence of the semi-detached pair.

12.3 The render will be coordinated with the proposed grey aluminium windows and doors, Yorkshire stone detailing and matching roof materials. The exact manufacturer and final colour can, if necessary, be agreed with the Local Planning Authority prior to installation.

13.0 RESIDENTIAL AMENITY

13.1 The use remains wholly residential. The position and design of the extensions have been considered in relation to surrounding dwellings and the established relationship between the two halves of the semi-detached pair.

13.2 The application property occupies a substantial plot and meaningful separation is retained from surrounding properties. The proposal does not seek to create an abnormal relationship of direct overlooking.

13.3 The development is therefore considered capable of maintaining an appropriate relationship with neighbouring dwellings in terms of privacy, outlook, daylight and general residential amenity.

14.0 ACCESS AND PARKING

14.1 The existing vehicular access from Oldfield Road is retained.

14.2 The proposal incorporates a 27.5 m² integral garage within the two-storey side extension, together with the open-sided car port and retained external hardstanding. Parking can therefore continue to be accommodated within the residential curtilage.

14.3 No separate dwelling, independent access or separate residential planning unit is created.

15.0 LANDSCAPE AND SITE CHARACTER

15.1 The site benefits from a substantial private rear garden together with established vegetation and boundary planting, which contribute to the semi-rural character of this part of Oldfield Road.

15.2 Additional built form is deliberately concentrated around the established dwelling. The substantial eastern/rear portion of the garden remains undeveloped and continues to provide openness and separation.

15.3 The restrained material palette, maintenance of principal building height and low rear extension assist in integrating the enlarged dwelling into its setting.

16.0 SUSTAINABILITY AND RENEWABLE ENERGY

16.1 Sustainability is incorporated as an integral part of the architectural design. Drawing 2025-08-002 Rev B identifies 445W dual-glass full-black N-type mono photovoltaic panels installed using an AV/GSE roof-integrated mounting system.

16.2 The roof-integrated approach has been selected in preference to a more visually prominent surface-mounted array. The full-black panels will form part of the roof plane and provide a cleaner and more coordinated appearance.

16.3 The photovoltaic installation will generate renewable electricity at the point of use, reducing reliance upon grid-supplied electricity and operational carbon associated with occupation of the dwelling.

16.4 The proposal also retains and adapts the existing dwelling rather than demolishing and replacing it, retaining embodied carbon within the existing structure while allowing new elements of the envelope to be constructed to contemporary thermal-performance standards.

16.5 A smart 32-amp Type 2 electric vehicle charging point will be installed within the garage to serve the dwelling's on-site parking provision. This will enable convenient charging at home and support the use of electric vehicles. Together with the proposed roof-integrated photovoltaic panels, it forms part of the measures to improve the environmental performance and long-term functionality of the property.

17.0 OVERALL GREEN BELT ASSESSMENT

17.1 The application site lies within the Green Belt and the proposal has been assessed expressly against national decision-making Policies GB6 and GB7 of the National Planning Policy Framework (17 August 2026), in particular Policy GB7(1)(b), together with Policy LP57 of the Kirklees Local Plan.

17.2 The original dwelling has a GEA of approximately 105.0 m². The proposed additions provide approximately 94.0 m² of enclosed GEA, resulting in a total of approximately 199.0 m² and an increase of approximately 89.5%. These figures inform the assessment of proportionality alongside the height, form and distribution of the additions and their relationship with the original dwelling and adjoining No.57.

17.3 The quantitative figure does not, however, describe the complete physical effect of the proposal. The principal eaves and ridge heights remain unchanged at approximately 5.23 m and 7.90 m respectively; only 32.0 m² of additional GEA occurs at first-floor level; and the full-length rear extension is a substantially lower mono-pitched element at approximately 2.60 m to eaves and 3.48 m to ridge.

17.4 The comparative elevation assessment further demonstrates the distinction between floorspace and apparent massing. The four principal elevation areas collectively increase from approximately 203.2 m² to 276.2 m², an increase of approximately 35.9%. This is not advanced as a volume calculation, but is relevant quantitative evidence of the resulting external envelope.

17.5 A central consideration is the direct relationship with adjoining No.57 under planning permission 2017/62/90385/W. The proposed two-storey side extension and single-storey rear extension at No.59 are exactly the same dimensions as the corresponding extensions approved to No.57. The side addition therefore mirrors the adjoining extension in dimensions, height, roof form and proportions, while the rear addition matches its dimensions and aligns at eaves and ridge level. This is not a general comparison with another property in the locality; it is a direct architectural response to the other half of the same semi-detached pair.

17.6 This exact correspondence is relevant to the qualitative limb of Policy LP57 - whether the original building remains dominant in overall appearance - because the enlarged pair would be read as a coordinated architectural composition rather than as a single, unrelated extension projecting from one dwelling. The matching extensions would reinstate balance to the pair while retaining the established principal eaves and ridge heights.

17.7 Development remains concentrated around the established dwelling within an approximately 765 m² residential plot, leaving a substantial proportion of the elongated rear garden open and undeveloped. The proposal creates no additional dwelling and no detached enclosed residential building within the rear garden.

17.8 The car port is acknowledged as additional built form but its open-sided green-oak construction materially reduces enclosure and visual solidity.

17.9 The applicant therefore considers that the proper Green Belt assessment is one which gives full weight to the 89.5% GEA increase while also considering the actual height, bulk, massing, distribution,

elevation envelope, relationship with the original building, the exact dimensional relationship with the approved extensions to No.57, and the spatial and visual effect upon openness. Taken together, these matters provide the relevant context for the planning judgement required by Policy GB7(1)(b) and Policy LP57.

18.0 PLANNING BALANCE AND CONCLUSION

18.1 The principal planning issue is whether the proposed enlargement would result in a disproportionate increase in size compared with the original building for the purposes of Policy GB7(1)(b) of the NPPF, and whether the original building remains the dominant element in terms of size and overall appearance for the purposes of Policy LP57.

18.2 The proposal represents an 89.5% increase in enclosed GEA and that figure is not understated. However, neither national policy nor LP57 establishes a fixed numerical percentage threshold. The assessment of proportionality is a planning judgement which must consider the physical and visual consequences of the proposal, including footprint/floorspace, height, scale, bulk, massing, built form and the relationship with the original building and its immediate context.

18.3 In the particular circumstances of this site, the principal height of the dwelling does not increase; the two-storey extension continues the existing 5.23 m eaves and 7.90 m ridge levels; only 32.0 m² of the additional GEA is at first-floor level; and the rear extension is contained beneath a low mono-pitched roof at 2.60 m eaves and 3.48 m ridge.

18.4 The combined elevation-area increase of approximately 35.9% provides further evidence that the 89.5% GEA increase does not equate to an equivalent increase in apparent external massing.

18.5 Particular weight is placed on the architectural relationship with No.57. Planning permission 2017/62/90385/W approved a two-storey side extension and single-storey rear extension to the adjoining half of the same semi-detached pair. The present proposal does more than broadly reflect that development: both proposed extensions are exactly the same dimensions as their corresponding approved extensions at No.57. The proposal therefore adopts a scale and form already established as the design response to the adjoining half of the same original building, restoring symmetry and producing a coherent overall composition.

18.6 The proposal additionally retains a substantial open rear garden, concentrates development around the existing dwelling, incorporates an open-sided car port rather than an equivalent enclosed structure, improves the external appearance through replacement of the existing pebble dash with a neutral smooth through-coloured render, and incorporates roof-integrated photovoltaic generation.

18.7 These considerations do not remove the need for the Local Planning Authority to make the required independent judgement under Policy GB7(1)(b) and Policy LP57, nor is the permission at No.57 advanced as determining the outcome of this application. The No.57 development is, however, substantially more relevant than a general precedent elsewhere because it is the approved extension form of the physically attached half of the same semi-detached building. The exact dimensional match is therefore important site-specific evidence when assessing scale, overall appearance, design coherence and the actual contextual effect of the proposal.

18.8 Taken as a whole, the proposal represents a carefully coordinated enlargement and environmental improvement of the existing family dwelling, designed to respond directly to the established adjoining built form while retaining the principal height, substantial rear-garden openness and residential character of the site.

18.9 It is therefore respectfully requested that the Local Planning Authority assesses the proposal on the basis of the complete quantitative and qualitative evidence presented in this Statement, including the accurate GEA calculation, three-dimensional massing, elevation-area comparison, unchanged principal heights, immediate approved design context and effect upon Green Belt openness, alongside the relevant provisions of the NPPF, Policy LP57 and the Council's House Extensions and Alterations SPD.