

**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:	2025/62/91288/E
Site Address:	11, St John Parade, Westtown, Dewsbury, WF13 2QN
Description:	Erection of single storey extension to side
Recommending Officer:	Faiza Bano

DECISION – CONDITIONAL FULL PERMISSION

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

John Holmes

AUTHORISED OFFICER

Date: 17-Jul-2025

HOUSEHOLDER DELEGATED REPORT

Application Number	2025/91288
Location	11, St John Parade, Westtown, Dewsbury, WF13 2QN
Proposal	Erection of single storey extension to side
Publicity end date	4 th July 2025
Number of representations received	One.
Kirklees Local Plan Allocation/Designation	Unallocated,
Extension to Time (EoT)	Yes – 21/07/2025
Recommendation	Conditional Full Permission

	NO	YES
Applicant a Council Member or Officer in Investment and Regeneration (Skills and Regeneration)	✓	
Contrary to previous decision	✓	
Called in by Ward Member	✓	
Significant number of representations received	✓	

If 'No' to all above, proceed with a fast track report

By indicating that the development proposal complies with relevant national and local policy and the 'House Extensions and Alterations' Supplementary Planning Document, the planning officer is taking into account the information submitted with the application, any previous relevant applications, observations during any site visit, any comments received in connection with the application and any other considerations which are material to the decision.

Policy

National

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) December 2024
National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG)

- NPPF Chapter 2 – Achieving sustainable development

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

Local

Kirklees Local Plan (LP):

- **LP 1** – Achieving sustainable development
- **LP 2** – Place shaping
- **LP 21** – Highways and access
- **LP 22** – Parking
- **LP 24** – Design
- **LP 51** – Protection and improvement of air quality

Supplementary Planning Document ‘House Extensions and Alterations’ (2021).

- Key design principle 1: Local character and street scene
- Key design principle 2: Impact on the original house
- 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
- Key design principle 8: Energy efficiency
- Key design principle 9: Construction materials
- Key design principle 10: Renewable energy
- Key design principle 11: Water retention
- Key design principle 12: Natural environment
- Key design principle 13: Vegetation and tree planting
- Key design principle 14: Drainage and flood risk
- Key design principle 15: Provision for parking
- Key design principle 16: Provision for waste storage
- Key design principle 17: Access for all users

	YES / NO	SUMMARY
Negotiations/Amendments during course of application	No	N/A
Parish/Town Council comments sought (Kirkburton)	No	N/A

Planning History	Yes	2007/93766: Erection of Two Storey Extension and Detached Garage - Conditional Full Permission
Consultations required	No	N/A

Assessment

The Kirklees SPD sets out that single storey side extensions should comply with certain parameters set out at paragraph 5.17 on page 28 (and listed below) and if they do not, they need to be justified:

Single storey side extensions should be offset and complement the original building. As such, single storey side extensions should:	<u>Yes - COMPLY</u>	<u>No - JUSTIFY</u>
not extend more than two thirds of the width of the original house;	Yes – the proposed extension projects out by 2.25m	
not exceed a height of 4 metres; and	Yes – the extension has an eaves height of 2.5m from ground level and is designed with a lean-to roof.	
be set back at least 500mm from the original building line to allow for a visual break		No – the proposed extension isn't set back from the principle front elevation; however, it is considered acceptable as the dwelling is set back from the street and the proposal is single storey in nature. The fact a single storey extension could be undertaken under pd rights from this part of the building is also noted.

Design and Visual Amenity:

Summary of local street scene/character:

The application site refers to 11, St John Parade, Westtown, Dewsbury, WF13 2QN; a two storey, semi-detached dwelling.

The application property is constructed from red brick, with grey tiled roof, and white uPVC windows. To the front of the property is an open driveway, providing access and excellent parking provision on site and in curtilage. Boundary treatments are formed walls.

The site its context is wholly residential.

Consideration has been given here in terms of the proposals impact on the local character and street scene, including subservience, terracing and building line.

	Relevant key design principle (KDP) of the SPD, Policy in the Kirklees Local Plan and the NPPF	Further comments	✓ / X / N/A
Impact on the Local character and street scene	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • KDP1 of the SPD • Policy LP24 Design (a) and (c) of the KLP • Chapter 12 NPPF 	The extension is generally modest in scale and the proposed development would not appear overly prominent. The proposed development would be located to the side of the property and will not impact the character or street scene across the frontage of the property.	✓
Impact on original house	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • KDP2 of the SPD • Policy LP24 Design (c) and (d) of the KLP • Chapter 12 of the NPPF 	The original property would remain the dominant feature.	✓
Height, scale and massing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • KDP 1 and 2 of the SPD • Policy LP24 Design (a), (c) and (d) of the KLP 	As above. The extension would project across the side of the property and is single storey.	✓

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chapter 12 of the NPPF 		
Facing materials and detailing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • KDP 9 of the SPD • Policy LP24 Design (d) (iii) of the KLP • Chapter 12 of the NPPF 	Facing materials to match existing.	✓
Roof style	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • KDP 1 and 2 of the SPD • Policy LP24 Design (a), (c) and (d) of the KLP • Chapter 12 of the NPPF 	Lean-to roof style on the side – acceptable as it is in-keeping with the original roof style of the host property.	✓
Window proportions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • KDP 1 and 2 of the SPD • Policy LP24 Design (a), (c) and (d) of the KLP • Chapter 12 of the NPPF 	Modest size windows in extension, including rooflights, which would be in-keeping with existing building.	✓
Accessibility for all users	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • KDP 17 of the SPD • Policy LP24 Design (f) • Chapter 12 of the NPPF 	Private domestic extension which would provide easy access into the main house.	✓

The design of the proposal is therefore acceptable and accords with policies LP24 of the adopted Kirklees Local Plan, the SPD and the NPPF.

Residential Amenity:

The main properties affected are:

- 9 St John Parade – this is the adjoining semi-detached property. there will be no impact on this property as the development is located along the other side of the shared boundary.
- 13 St John Parade – The proposed development is located close to the shared boundary. However, given the single storey nature of the extension and the lean-to roof style it is considered there will be no significant impact on the dwelling in terms of overshadowing/overbearing impact. In terms of privacy, there are no windows along the side elevation that directly face this property. However, there are proposed rooflights along the roof plane of the

extension. Given the nature of the proposal and the location of the rooflights, impact on privacy is determined to be minimal.

- 18 & 20 St John Parade – located across the road from the application site. Shall see additional bulk and massing to the application site, however, given the distance between the properties, it is determined that there will be no impact on these dwellings.
- 16 & 14 Park Avenue – these properties are located to the rear of the application site. These properties shall see additional bulk and massing to the application site, however, given the distance between the properties, it is determined that there will be no impact on these dwellings.

	Relevant key design principle (KDP) of the SPD, Policy in the Kirklees Local Plan and the NPPF	Further comments	✓ / X / N/A
Impact on privacy of neighbours (to sides, rear and front)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • KDP 3 & 4 of the SPD • Policy LP24 Design (d) (iv) • Chapter 12 of the NPPF 	Acceptable for the reasons set out above.	✓
Impact on light and outlook of neighbours (to sides, rear and front)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • KDP 4, 5, 6 of the SPD • Policy LP24 Design (b) • Chapter 12 of the NPPF 	As above.	✓
Remaining garden space of application property	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • KDP 7 of the SPD • Policy LP24 Design (b) and (c) • Chapter 12 of the NPPF 	Front and rear garden space remain unaffected. The extension is proposed to the side of the dwelling where an existing utility area already exists. Access will still be available around the proposed extension.	✓

The proposal is therefore acceptable in terms of residential amenity and accords with policy LP24 of the adopted Kirklees Local Plan, the SPD and the NPPF.

Highways and Parking: Are the following acceptable?

	Relevant key design principle (KDP) of the SPD, Policy in the Kirklees Local Plan and the NPPF	Further comments	✓ / X / N/A
Impact on highway safety	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • KDP 15 of the SPD • Policy LP22 Parking (f) of the KLP • Chapter 12 of the NPPF 	<p>The application property, as existing, has an open driveway. The proposed extension would result in the loss of space to the side which has the potential to be utilised for vehicular parking although it is acknowledged this space is constrained.</p> <p>In this case weight is afforded to the fact that through the scope of permitted development the applicants could potentially build something similar as to that which is proposed and to the side of the original dwellings side wall. Given this, the it is considered refusal on the loss of parking spaces could not be substantiated in this case.</p>	✓
Parking provision	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • KDP 15 of the SPD • Policy LP22 Parking (f) of the KLP • Chapter 12 of the NPPF 	As above.	✓
Provision for waste storage	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • KDP 16 of the SPD • Policy LP24 Design (d) (iv) • Chapter 12 of the NPPF 	None shown on plans however, there is sufficient space within the red line boundary to allow for storage on site. Condition not considered necessary.	✓

The proposal is therefore acceptable in terms of highways and parking and accords with policies LP21 and LP22 of the adopted Kirklees Local Plan, the SPD and the NPPF.

Other matters: Are the following acceptable?

	Relevant key design principle (KDP) of the SPD, Policy in the Kirklees Local Plan and the NPPF	Further comments	✓ / X / N/A
Impact on trees	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • KDP 13 of the SPD • Policy LP24 Design (d) (i) (iv) Policy LP33 Trees • Chapter 12 of the NPPF 	N/A	✓
Impact on ecology	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • KDP 12 of the SPD • Policy LP30 • Chapter 15 of the NPPF 	N/A	✓
Carbon Budget / Climate change statement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • KDP 8, 9, 10 & 11 of the SPD • Policy LP51 • Chapter 14 of the NPPF 	Small scale domestic development to an existing dwelling. As such, no special measures required in terms of the planning application with regards to carbon emissions. A Climate Change Statement has been submitted with this application.	✓
Drainage and Flood Risk	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • KDP 14 of the SPD • Policy LP24 (d) (vii), LP27 and LP34 of the KLP 	The rear garden and landscaping would be retained to allow for run-off. The site is not located within an identified Flood Risk Zone 2 or 3 area.	✓

The proposal is therefore acceptable in terms of the above listed other matters and accords with policies set out in the Kirklees Local Plan, the SPD and the NPPF.

Representations, including Parish/Town Council comments:

As a result of site publicity, one representation was received.

The following reasons were raised for objection:

1. **Boundary Wall Ownership and Consent** The applicants have indicated their intention to remove the shared boundary wall in order to construct their proposed extension. I have explicitly informed them that I do not consent to the demolition, modification, or use of this wall in any way.
2. **Loss of Light** Due to the proposed proximity and height of the extension, I am concerned that it will result in a loss of natural light to my property,
3. **Restriction of Driveway Use & Increased Risk of Damage** The side of my property contains a driveway which I use for parking. Currently, access is already narrow. The proposed extension would further narrow this access, likely making my driveway unusable. If a vehicle were to accidentally collide with the proposed extension wall, the cost and consequence of repairs would be substantially higher than with the existing simple boundary wall, which is easier and cheaper to fix. This poses an increased financial and safety risk due to the proximity of the new structure to vehicle movements.
4. **Negative Impact on Character of the Street** No other homes on this street currently have a side extension. Additionally, should I decide to build a side extension in the future, both properties could end up touching or having an extremely narrow gap, potentially leading to a terracing effect. This would change the nature of the houses from semi-detached to something more akin to terraced housing, thereby potentially reducing property values and further impacting the street's character.

Officer's response:

1. *Any modifications to the boundary treatment are considered a civil matter. Demolition of the boundary wall is not development for which planning permission would be required and could be undertaken in any event.*
1. *Although the proposed extension is close in proximity, the single storey nature of the extension is not considered to lead to significant levels of overshadowing in this case taking account of the scale of the proposal.*
2. *The proposed extension is located 22cm away from the existing boundary wall as such the proposal is not considered to significantly alter the existing situation in this regard and refusal on such grounds could not be substantiated.*
3. *The visual impact is taken into account in the Assessment section of this report. It is considered the development would be acceptable in this regard, taking account of the extent of works which could be undertaken through utilisation of pd rights in this case.*

Plan Type	Reference	Version	Date Received
Existing and proposed elevations and floor plans	01		12-May-2025
Block Plan			12-May-2025
Location Plan	Location Plan		12-May-2025
General	Climate Change Statement		12-May-2025

Pursuant to article 35 (2) of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) Order 2015 and guidance in the National Planning Policy Framework, the Local Authority have, where possible, made a pre-application advice service available, complied with the Kirklees Development Management Charter 2024 and otherwise actively engaged with the applicant in dealing with the application. It was not considered necessary to seek any amendments/further information during the course of this application.

Report Dated: 17/07/2025