
Report of the Head of Planning and Development

HUDDERSFIELD PLANNING SUB-COMMITTEE

Date: 19-Oct-2023

Subject: Planning Application 2023/91462 Erection of single storey side extension and enlarged porch with associated external alterations 17, Maplin Avenue, Salendine Nook, Huddersfield, HD3 3GP

APPLICANT

W Khalil

DATE VALID

24-May-2023

TARGET DATE

19-Jul-2023

EXTENSION EXPIRY DATE

14-Sep-2023

Please click the following link for guidance notes on public speaking at planning committees, including how to pre-register your intention to speak.

[Public speaking at committee link](#)

LOCATION PLAN



Map not to scale – for identification purposes only

Electoral wards affected: Lindley Ward

Ward Councillors consulted: No

Public or private: Public

RECOMMENDATION: REFUSE

1. The proposed extension, by virtue of its siting on a prominent corner plot, proximity to the side boundary, scale and design, would result in a dominant and unsympathetic addition to the host dwelling. It would be a visually cramped and overprominent form of development within the streetscene. The proposal would therefore cause detrimental harm to the visual amenities of the locality, contrary to Policies LP2 and LP24 a) and c) of the Kirklees Local Plan, Key Design Principles 1 and 2 of the Council's adopted House Extensions and Alterations SPD and policies contained within Chapter 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

1.0 INTRODUCTION:

1.1 The application is brought to Planning Sub Committee at the request of Ward Councillors Cahal Burke and Councillor Anthony Smith who has provided the following reason:

"We would like this referring to the sub-committee please as we feel the corner plot will accommodate the development without being cramped. Given this is a single-story extension, the use of sympathetic materials and presence/maintenance of an existing boundary wall and tall mature hedges around the boundary, we do not believe this would create a prominent visual intrusion."

1.2 The Chair of Huddersfield Sub-Committee has accepted the reason for making this request, having regard for the Councillor's Protocol for Planning Committees.

2.0 SITE AND SURROUNDINGS:

2.1 The application site relates to 17 Maplin Avenue, an extended two-storey detached dwellinghouse on a prominent corner plot location adjacent Maplin Drive. It sits within a steeply sloping area with land falling from northeast to southwest, is partially bounded by low stone walls, some hedging (in parts), horizontal timber fencing and mortar block wall to the rear atop the low stone walls within its elevated land.

2.2 The property has already been substantially extended with limited rear amenity space remaining but more generous open land to the front and side. To the rear, viewed from Maplin Drive, the property is on elevated ground to the highway appearing as a prominent building on the corner plot. The existing single-storey rear extension has a chamfered corner aiding in some openness/separation distance to the boundary. There is a driveway and hard surfacing leading up to an integrated garage (internally ~5.5m deep by ~2.3m wide) and single storey front porch which are forward of the main body of the property. It is constructed of coursed stone to the frontage and concrete tile, with white render to the rear and buff brick to the side as a secondary material.

2.3 The site is situated within a wider residential area, with detached properties similarly constructed with material palette and architectural style. The site is unallocated on the Kirklees Local Plan.

3.0 PROPOSAL:

- 3.1 It is proposed to erect a single-storey side extension flush with the existing front elevation of the garage. This would project 3.4m from the side, be 5.9m deep with a small rear projection extending 1.5m from the side x 1.3m deep. It would have a gable end pitch roof to both elements with a height of eaves 2.3m from ground level; the ground level to the side of the property is sloping.
- 3.2 The side extension would be faced in stone at front and brick to the side and rear. They would be roofed in tiles to match the host. There would be a bay window feature at the front projecting forward of the original host property. There would also be a window in the rear elevation.
- 3.3 This extension would serve as an additional living room with shower room.
- 3.4 The existing garage would be partially converted into a storeroom at rear with the front of the garage divided and to be integrated with the existing porch to form a larger porch. This would remove an existing W.C to the porch. The front elevation of the extended porch would be faced in stone with a new main front door with sidelights and two narrow windows. This would retain a flat roof design.
- 3.5 To the host, an existing window to the first floor of the side elevation would be reduced in height to accommodate the side extension.
- 3.6 Off street parking would be retained on the driveway to the front of the dwellinghouse.

4.0 RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY (including enforcement history):

At the application site:

- 4.1 2022/91031 – Erection of single storey front and side extensions. Refused on 2nd November 2022.
- Officer Note:** The present application to be determined is 0.5m narrower in width than the previous application but otherwise of the same design.
- 4.2 91/01047 – Erection of first floor and single storey extensions. Approved on 30th April 1991. This pertained to a first-floor side extension and a large single-storey rear extension which has been built out.

5.0 HISTORY OF NEGOTIATIONS (including revisions to the scheme):

- 5.1 Following refusal of the previous application 2022/91031, the applicant contacted Planning Officers to discuss potential alternate arrangements. Officers advised that it may be possible to have a smaller side extension which is set back from the main body of the primary elevation following guidelines in the House Extensions and Alterations SPD (page 28). This could include existing space within the garage to form a large living area. Alternatively, conversion of the integral garage to living accommodation does not require planning permission in this instance and may achieve the extra room desired.

5.2 Officers requested additional information to be submitted to determine whether alternate arrangements were feasible to meet the specific needs of the applicants. Submission of information supplied found that some internal alterations to provide the accommodation could be feasible, specifically to meet the needs of the applicants. Such arrangements would overcome the visual concerns regarding the submitted scheme. Officers requested a justification for the proposal from the agent on how the scheme would meet the needs of the applicant, when there appears to be alternatives available. No additional information had been received at the time that the report was prepared for publication.

6.0 PLANNING POLICY:

6.1 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. The site is in a locality where there is a known presence of bats and which is identified by the Coal Authority as being potentially unstable land due to former mining activity.

6.2 Kirklees Local Plan (2019):

- **LP1** – Achieving sustainable development
- **LP2** – Place shaping
- **LP21** – Highway safety
- **LP22** – Parking
- **LP24** – Design
- **LP28** – Drainage
- **LP30** – Biodiversity and geodiversity
- **LP53** – Contaminated and unstable land

6.3 Supplementary Planning Guidance / Documents:

- House Extensions and Alterations SPD
- Highways Design Guide SPD

6.4 National Planning Guidance:

National planning policy and guidance is set out in National Policy Statements, primarily the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) updated 5th September 2023, the Planning Practice Guidance Suite (PPGS) first launched 6th March 2014 together with Circulars, Ministerial Statements and associated technical guidance. The NPPF constitutes guidance for local planning authorities and is a material consideration in determining applications.

- **Chapter 2** – Achieving sustainable development
- **Chapter 4** – Decision-making
- **Chapter 9** – Promoting sustainable transport
- **Chapter 12** – Achieving well-designed places

- **Chapter 14** – Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change
- **Chapter 15** – Conserving and enhancing the natural environment

7.0 PUBLIC/LOCAL RESPONSE:

- 7.1 We are currently undertaking statutory publicity requirements, as set out at Table 1 in the Kirklees Development Management Charter. As such, we have publicised this application via neighbour notification letters which expired on 30th June 2023. No representations were received.
- 7.2 The description of development as advertised described the porch as being enhanced, for clarity this is recommended to state 'enlarged' and the description updated to state this. It is considered the description as advertised adequately alerted the public to the nature of the development and further advertisement of the proposal following the update to the description was not necessary in this case.

8.0 CONSULTATION RESPONSES:

8.1 Statutory:

None necessary

9.0 MAIN ISSUES

- Principle of development
- Visual amenity and urban design issues
- Residential amenity
- Highway issues
- Other matters
- Representations

10.0 APPRAISAL

Principle of development

- 10.1 The site is without notation on the Kirklees Local Plan. Policy LP1 of the Kirklees Local Plan 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.
- 10.2 Policy LP1 of the Kirklees Local Plan goes on further to state that: *"The Council will always work proactively 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"*.
- 10.3 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".

- 10.4 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.

Visual amenity and urban design issues

- 10.5 Policies LP1, LP2 and LP24 of the Kirklees Local Plan are all relevant, as these policies seek to achieve good quality design that retains a sense of local identity, which is in keeping with the scale of development within the area and is visually attractive. With reference to extensions, Policy LP24(c) of the Kirklees Local Plan states these should be 'subservient to the original building' and 'in keeping with the existing building in terms of scale, materials and details.'
- 10.6 These aims are also reinforced within Chapter 12 of the NPPF (Achieving well-designed plans) where paragraph 126 provides an overarching consideration of design stating that: *"the creation of high-quality buildings and places are fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve. Good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, creates better places in which to live and work and helps make development acceptable to communities."* Paragraph 130 of the NPPF states that planning decisions should ensure developments are sympathetic to local character, including the surrounding built environment.
- 10.7 With regard to the House Extensions and Alterations SPD, Key Design Principles 1 and 2 are relevant which state:
- Principle 1 – 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."*
 - Principle 2 – 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 detail."*
- 10.8 Section 5 of the House Extensions and Alterations SPD also provides guidance for specific types of extensions and alterations which will be referred to in this assessment.

Single-storey side extension

- 10.9 Section 5.3 of the House Extensions and Alterations SPD relates to side extensions, with paragraph 5.15 of this SPD stating that: *"Side extensions should be located and designed to minimise the impact on the local character of the area. The design should reflect the design of the original building in terms of roof style, pitch materials and detailing."*
- 10.10 Paragraph 5.17 of the SPD goes on to state that: *"Single storey side extensions should:*
- *not extend more than two thirds of the width of the original house;*
 - *not exceed a height of 4 metres; and*
 - *be set back at least 500mm from the original building line to allow for a visual break.*

10.11 In addition, the proposal would be forward of the main body of the host and as such Section 5.2 of the House Extensions and Alterations SPD relates to front extensions and it states the following:

“Front extensions are highly prominent in the street scene and can erode the character of the area if they are not carefully designed. Large extensions (single and two-storey) and conservatories on the front of an existing house are likely to appear particularly intrusive and will not normally be acceptable. Single storey extensions on the front of a house and two-storey or first floor front extensions are usually unacceptable due to the impact on the character of the area and visual amenity and will not normally be permitted unless:

- The house is set well back from the pavement or is well screened; and*
- The extension is small, subservient to the original building, well designed and would not harm the character of the original house or the area; and*
- The materials and design match the existing features of the original house; and*
- The extension would not unreasonably affect the neighbouring properties.”*

10.12 In this case, the single-storey side extension would comply with all but the last design parameter of paragraph 5.17 of the SPD; it would not be set back 0.5m from the original building line. Due to the front elevation being aligned with the porch, cumulatively the design would appear with the existing modified porch extension to form a large, dominant, front projection to the property. This is accentuated by the property being forward of the building line along Maplin Avenue and on higher land in relation to Maplin Drive. It would be partially screened by the hedging to the front and side but would be visible at the rear, viewed on rising land and sited very close to the highway boundary, especially the one shared with the side and rear boundary of the site. This dominant design of the proposal and prominence of the site would be further emphasised by its proximity to the edge of the site, cumulative mass of extensions, which would also result in an overall development that would appear cramped on the site.

10.13 The proposed pitch roof design would add an incongruous roof design in relation to the host's own cross gable roof design and the existing flat roof of the porch and failing to be a sympathetic or well-designed addition with its increased bulk and massing to the original host complicating the design. The bay window would be forward of the principal front elevation, as large as the existing original bay window of the host. This would further dominate the host dwelling's original design sited forward of the building line.

10.14 While the materials are to match the host, the proposed dominant bulk and massing forward of the host within the corner plot and so excessively close to the boundary, would still appear as an unsympathetic addition within the front and side amenity space.

10.15 Paragraph 5.23 of the SPD provides additional guidance in relation to 'corner plots'. This states that: 'On corner plots, side extensions should be considered as being both side and front extensions and as such will relate to both street frontages. Therefore, both elevations should be designed as street frontages. On corner plots, side extensions should contribute to the local character by:

- facing in both directions to create two frontages, each with windows overlooking the street;*

- *being set back from the existing building line on both streets; and*
- *following the boundary treatment along both streets, in relation to its position, height and materials.'*

- 10.16 The proposal would not have two frontages incorporated within its design, nor be set back from the existing building line on Maplin Avenue and Maplin Drive with the side extension sited closely to the boundary. This would be in part screened by the existing boundary hedging to the side however the single-storey side extension would still appear as a prominent feature from Maplin Drive; being on an elevated position and would close the gap to boundary reducing the sense of openness. The existing green hedge would not adequately aid in screening the dominating effect of the proposal and it is considered that the design would be unsympathetic to the existing dwelling and the streetscene.
- 10.17 Whilst the scheme could be amended to include windows alongside the side elevation to create an active frontage without much impact on the residential amenity of the neighbours, this would not sufficiently address the adverse impacts of its bulk and massing of its built form so close to its boundary to Maplin Drive within an exposed corner plot.
- 10.18 With regard to Key Design Principle 1 of the SPD, extensions should be in keeping with the character and design of the area and streetscene. The proposal would have matching materials harmonising with the area's established palette of materials. Considering the locality, two-storey detached properties appear to have a consistent size and scale, subsequent first floor side extensions had created a more built-up appearance close to the flank property for some properties. However, this has been mitigated by the topography and varying positions from the carriageway breaking up the bulk and massing. A significantly smaller single-storey side extension could appear of low impact with the front garden. This has been communicated to the agent – to set back from the main body of the host and reduce width to achieve a more sympathetic extension. However, the submitted scheme would introduce a prominent side extension that would not be subservient being forward of the host and creating an extended host building's footprint that would be out of scale and appearing unsympathetic to the host property and wider locality.
- 10.19 Considering Key Design Principle 2, the proposal would add a side/front extension to the previously extended original building and being sited forward of the host's front elevation, would be considered a dominant addition to the host. Cumulatively the proposed scale of development would fail to be in keeping with the host in terms of its scale and roof design.
- 10.20 It is therefore considered that the proposed extension, by virtue of its siting on a prominent corner plot, its proximity to the side boundary, its scale and its complicated form, would result in a dominant and unsympathetic addition to the front of the host dwelling, would result in a cramped form of development on the site and would constitute a prominent visual intrusion within the streetscene. The proposal would therefore cause detrimental harm to the visual amenities of the locality, contrary to Policy LP24 (a and c) of the Kirklees Local Plan, Key Design Principles 1 and 2 of the Council's adopted House Extensions and Alterations SPD and Government guidance contained within Chapters 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Residential Amenity

10.21 Section B and C of LP24 states that alterations to existing buildings should:

“...maintain appropriate distances between buildings’ and ‘...minimise impact on residential amenity of future and neighbouring occupiers.”

10.22 Further to this, Paragraph 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that planning decisions should ensure that developments have a high standard of amenity for existing and future users.

10.23 The House Extensions and Alterations SPD sets out a number of design principles which will need to be considered when assessing a proposal’s impact on residential amenity. These include:

- Key Design Principle 3 - that *“extensions and alterations should be designed to achieve reasonable levels of privacy for both inhabitants, future occupants, and neighbours.”*
- Key Design 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.”*
- Key Design Principle 5 - that *“extensions and alterations should not adversely affect the amount of natural light presently enjoyed by a neighbouring property.”*
- Key Design Principle 6 - that *“extensions and alterations should not unduly reduce the outlook from a neighbouring property.”*
- Key Design Principle 7 - that *“extensions and alterations should ensure an appropriately sized and useable area of private outdoor space is retained. Normally at least half the garden area should be retained as part of the proposals.”*

10.24 The impact of the development on each of the surrounding properties most likely to be impacted by the proposal will be assessed in turn.

19 Maplin Avenue

10.25 The proposed single-storey side extension would be largely screened by the bulk and massing of the host and sufficiently sited at some distance to the southwest of the neighbour avoiding any concerns regarding overlooking, overshadowing and overbearing or loss of privacy and outlook. The alterations to the porch would not increase bulk and massing to the existing porch. There would be an improvement in the existing relationship between neighbours regarding loss of privacy and overlooking as the existing porch’s side elevation would now be windowless.

No’s 1, 3, 5, 7 and 9 Maplin Drive

10.26 There would be very restricted oblique views from the rear window to No. 9 aided by the difference in ground levels between the two. Due to its single storey design, position northeast of the properties, blank side elevation and green screening, there would be no detrimental overlooking, overshadowing and overbearing to these properties on Maplin Drive.

No's. 12 and 14 Maplin Avenue

- 10.27 The proposal would be on elevated ground northwest of the properties, screened in part by the green hedging and would have its bay window separated by 26m at minimum to the front elevation of the properties which are angled away from the proposal. It is considered that the proposal would be sited such that it would not have a significant impact upon these properties in terms of overlooking, overshadowing and overbearing.

Future Occupiers

- 10.28 With reference to Principle 7 of the House Extension and Alterations SPD,

“Extensions and alterations should ensure an appropriately sized and useable area of private outdoor space is retained. Normally at least half the garden area should be retained as part of the proposals.”

And:

“Normally, front gardens will not be considered adequate useable private amenity space due to the lack of overall privacy for occupants.”

- 10.29 It is acknowledged that this proposal relates to a property with very limited rear amenity space and a large front and side amenity space screened in part by the green hedging. As a consequence of the proposal, the front and side amenity space at the site would decrease in size with no additional detrimental impacts on the remaining useable private amenity space. Thus, on balance, the remaining external amenity space provision is considered acceptable in this instance. The ensuing extension would provide a further lounge area and a shower room for residents.
- 10.30 In summary, the proposal would have an acceptable impact on residential amenity and would be compliant with Policy LP24b of the Kirklees Local Plan and policies within Chapter 12 of the NPPF in respect of residential amenity, as well as Key Design Principles 3-7 of the Council’s adopted House Extensions and Alterations SPD.

Highway issues

- 10.31 Key Design Principle 15 of the House Extensions and Alterations SPD states that: *“Extensions and alterations should maintain appropriate access and off-street ‘in curtilage’ parking.”*
- 10.32 The existing integral garage would be converted into a storage space and porch. In this instance, no compensatory parking has been provided, nor has it been identified on a plan. It is considered that the garage’s internal dimensions would not fully meet the requirements of modern vehicular parking standards set out the Highways Design Guide SPD. The Kirklees Highways Design Guide SPD and the House Extensions and Alterations SPD set out that a 3-bedroom dwelling should be served by 2 off-street parking spaces. Part of the front amenity space is given over to driveway, which is of an area sufficient to provide off street parking for two vehicles with turning space.

10.33 Therefore, having taken into account the above, it is considered an acceptable level of parking can be provided on site. It is considered that the proposal would accord with Policies LP21 and LP22 of the Kirklees Local Plan, Chapter 9 of the NPPF, Key Design Principle 15 of the House Extensions and Alterations SPD and the guidance within the Council's Highways Design Guide SPD.

Other Matters

Climate change

10.34 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. A Climate Change Statement was supplied.

10.35 Key Design Principles 8-11 of the House Extensions and Alterations SPD relate to planning for climate change. Of note:

- Key Design Principle 8 (Energy Efficiency) states: *"Extensions and alterations should, where practicable, maximise energy efficiency."*
- Key Design Principle 9 (Construction Materials) states: *"Extensions and alterations should seek to use innovative construction materials and techniques, including reclaimed and recycled materials where possible."*
- Key Design Principle 10 (Renewable Energy) states: *"Extensions and alterations should consider the use of renewable energy."*
- Key Design Principle 11 (Water Retention) states: *"Extensions and alterations should consider designing water retention into the proposals."*

10.36 In this case, due to the nature of the proposal, it is not considered reasonable to require the applicant to put forward any specific resilience measures. However, it has been noted that the extensions would be partly finished in stonework, which is a high-quality natural material. The extensions would also aid passive solar gain and would be constructed to modern specifications to ensure thermal efficiency. This would be in accordance with the aims of Chapter 14 of the NPPF, as well as Key Design Principles 14 and 15 of the House Extensions and Alterations SPD.

Biodiversity

10.37 Chapter 15 of the NPPF relates to conserving and enhancing the Natural Environment. Paragraph 179 of the NPPF outlines that decisions should promote the protection and recovery of priority species, and to identify and pursue opportunities for securing net gains for biodiversity. Paragraph 180 goes on to note that if significant harm to biodiversity resulting from development cannot be avoided, adequately mitigated, or, as a last resort, compensated for, then planning permission should be refused.

10.38 Policy LP30 of the Kirklees Local Plan echoes the NPPF in respect of biodiversity. Policy LP30 outlines that development proposals should minimise impacts on biodiversity and provide net biodiversity gains through good design by incorporating biodiversity enhancements and habitat creation where opportunities exist. Further to this, Key Design Principle 12 of the House Extensions and Alterations SPD states that: *“Extensions and alterations should consider how they might contribute towards the enhancement of the natural environment and biodiversity.”*

10.39 In this instance, the proposal would be within a bat alert area although it would not disturb the existing two-storey eaves of the property. Careful attention has been paid to look for evidence of bat roost potential during the site visit and the roof appears well sealed around the eaves and roof area. This would be therefore considered unlikely to support roosting bats. Due to the small scale of the proposed development, it would not be necessary in this instance to require improvements in biodiversity to comply with the aforementioned policies should it be approved.

Waste storage and collection

10.40 Key Design Principle 16 of the SPD states that extensions and alterations should maintain appropriate storage arrangements for waste. It is considered that the existing arrangements would not significantly alter as a result of the proposal.

Highway Structures

10.41 The proposed bulk and massing could impose additional loading on the adjoining private retaining wall abutting Maplin Drive and therefore Policy LP53 of the Kirklees Local Plan is relevant. Further details were requested by the Highway Structures Team consultation response to assess impact under the previously application 2022/91031 in relation to the retaining wall adjacent to both Maplin Drive and Maplin Avenue. Officers did not seek the additional information as it was concluded that the proposal was not acceptable in terms of its visual impact. Should Members be minded to approve this application, this could be conditioned – with a pre-commencement condition - to control the risks to a public highway prior to the commencement of the construction.

Land Stability

10.42 The application site falls within an area at high risk of ground movement as a result of past mining activities as determined by the Coal Authority. Whilst falling within a high-risk area the Coal Authority identify the development type as that which does not need submission of a Coal Mining Risk Assessment. As such it is considered that it is unnecessary in this case to require a survey of land stability to be carried out with regard to previous mining activity which may have taken place within the locality. It is recommended that the Coal Authority’s standing advice is provided with any grant of approval. As such it is considered that the proposal is acceptable with regard to ground stability in accordance with policy LP53 and paragraphs 174 and 183 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Representations

- 10.43 No Representations were received in relation to this proposal.
- 10.44 Cllrs Burke and Smith requested this item to be considered by Committee for the following reason:

“We would like this referring to the sub-committee please as we feel the corner plot will accommodate the development without being cramped. Given this is a single-story extension, the use of sympathetic materials and presence/maintenance of an existing boundary wall and tall mature hedges around the boundary, we do not believe this would create a prominent visual intrusion.”

- 10.45 Officers have set out their evaluation of the scheme taking into account the points raised by Ward Councillors, see paragraphs 10.5-10.20.

11.0 CONCLUSION

- 11.1 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.
- 11.2 This application has been assessed against relevant policies in the development plan and other materials considerations. In this instance, the development does not accord with Policy LP24 a) and c) of the Kirklees Local Plan, Key Design Principles 1 and 2 of the Council’s adopted House Extensions and Alterations SPD and Government guidance contained within Chapters 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The application of policies in the NPPF that protect visual amenity are of particular importance and provide a clear reason for refusing the development proposed.
- 11.3 The proposal is therefore considered to be contrary to policy LP2 which seeks to ensure all development proposals build on the strengths, opportunities and help address challenges identified in the Local Plan, in order to protect and enhance the qualities which contribute to the character of these places.

Background Papers:

Application and history files.

[Planning application details | Kirklees Council](https://www.kirklees.gov.uk/beta/planning-applications/search-for-planning-applications/detail.aspx?id=2023%2F91462)

<https://www.kirklees.gov.uk/beta/planning-applications/search-for-planning-applications/detail.aspx?id=2023%2F91462>

Certificate of Ownership – Certificate A signed

Previous application:

2022/91031 – Erection of single storey front and side extensions. Refused on 2nd November 2022 -

[Planning application details | Kirklees Council](https://www.kirklees.gov.uk/beta/planning-applications/search-for-planning-applications/detail.aspx?id=2022%2F91031+)

<https://www.kirklees.gov.uk/beta/planning-applications/search-for-planning-applications/detail.aspx?id=2022%2F91031+>