

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:	2025/62/91652/E
Site Address:	3, Alpine Close, Batley, WF17 7PN
Description:	Erection of single storey front and rear extensions with front and rear dormers
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.

Kerri Simpson

AUTHORISED OFFICER

Date: 10-Oct-2025

HOUSEHOLDER DELEGATED REPORT

Application Number	2025/91652
Location	3, Alpine Close, Batley, WF17 7PN
Proposal	Erection of single storey front and rear extensions with front and rear dormers
Publicity end date	10 th July 2025
Number of representations received	None.
Kirklees Local Plan Allocation/Designation	LB Airport Consult, DEVELOPMENT_LOW_RISK_AREA
Extension to Time (EoT)	Yes – 10th October 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) July 2021
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	Yes	N/A
Parish/Town Council comments sought (Kirkburton)	No	N/A
Planning History	Yes	2025/90449: The proposal is for erection of single storey rear

		extension. The extension projects 5m beyond the rear wall of the original dwellinghouse. The maximum height of the extension is 4m, the height of the eaves of the extension is 3m - NANR - NOT REQUIRED
Consultations required	No	N/A

The Kirklees SPD sets out that single storey front extensions should comply with certain parameters set out at paragraph 5.14 on page 27 (and listed below) and if they do not, they need to be justified:

Single storey front extensions:	<u>Yes - COMPLY</u>	<u>No - JUSTIFY</u>
The house is set well back from the pavement or is well screened; and	Yes, the house is well set back	
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	Yes – the extension would appear subservient and has been designed with a lean-to and part pitched roof, in-keeping with host property.	
The materials and design match the existing features of the original house; and	Yes – materials would match existing	
The extension would not unreasonably affect the neighbouring properties.	Yes – the modest scale would result in minimal impact on neighbouring property as it is single storey, and the front building lines of these properties sit in front of the building line of the application site.	

The Kirklees SPD sets out that single storey rear extensions should comply with certain parameters set out at paragraph 5.2 on page 23 (and listed below) and if they do not, they need to be justified:

Rear Extensions Should:	<u>Yes - COMPLY</u>	<u>No - JUSTIFY</u>

respect the original house and garden in terms of its size and scale	Yes – the extension does not cover more than half of the total area around the original house.	
use appropriate materials which match or are similar in appearance to the original house; and	Yes – to match existing	
not have an adverse impact by way of overshadowing or loss of outlook of neighbouring properties.		The extension projects out by 5m, however, this application has a prior approval fallback in place.

The Kirklees SPD sets out that single storey rear extensions should comply with certain parameters set out in paragraph 5.6 on page 24 (and listed below) and if they do not, they need to be justified:

Single storey extensions should:	<u>Yes - COMPLY</u>	<u>No - JUSTIFY</u>
be in keeping with the scale and style of the original house;	Yes – The extension is designed to be in keeping with the scale and style of the original house. It uses matching materials and architectural features, ensuring it blends seamlessly with the existing structure.	
not normally cover more than half the total area around the original house (including previous extensions and outbuildings);	Yes – The extension does not cover more than half the total area around the original house	
not exceed 4 metres in height;	Yes – the extension has an overall height of 3.5m.	
not project out more than 3 metres from the rear wall of the original house for semi-detached and terraced houses or by 4 metres for detached properties;		No – the extension projects out by 5m. This is considered acceptable given that there is a PD fallback.

where they exceed 3m in length the eaves height should generally not exceed 2.5 meters; and		No – the eaves height is approximately 2.9m – acceptable for the reasons above.
retain a gap of at least 1 metre from a property boundary, such as a wall, fence or hedge.		No – acceptable due to the PD fallback.

The Kirklees SPD sets out that dormer window extensions should comply with certain parameters set out at paragraph 5.27 on page 32 (and listed below) and if they do not, they need to be justified:

Dormer windows should:	<u>Yes - COMPLY</u>	<u>No - JUSTIFY</u>
relate to the appearance of the house and existing roof;		No – While the proposed front dormers would demonstrate a resemblance to the original dwelling in terms of roof design, the proposed rear dormer does not particularly reflect the proportions or roof form of the host dwelling. However, a rear dormer of a similar scale and massing could reasonably be constructed under the property's permitted development rights. On this basis, significant weight is given to the Permitted Development (PD) fallback, and it would therefore be unreasonable to withhold permission for this element on design or visual amenity grounds.
be designed in style and materials similar to	Yes – Both the front and rear dormers	

the appearance of the existing house and roof;	would be constructed in materials to match the existing dwelling including slate cheeks. The front dormers would incorporate pitched roofs, while the rear dormer would be flat roofed, a PD fallback position exists as discussed above.	
not dominate the roof or project above the ridge of the house;	Yes – Proposed dormers do not unduly dominate the main roof nor project about the ridge.	
be set below the ridgeline of the existing roof and within the roof plane; and	Yes - Both the front and rear dormer/s would be set below the existing ridgeline.	
be aligned with existing dormer windows on neighbouring properties in the same roof plane where relevant.		No other dormers in the area so it is considered that in this instance it is not relevant.

Design and Visual Amenity: Are the considerations in the following table acceptable?

Summary of local street scene/character:

The site to which the application relates to is number 3, Alpine Close, Batley, WF17 7PN. The site consists of a two-storey mid-terrace dwelling, constructed from stone, tiles for the roof and Upvc for the openings. The site has an area of amenity space to the front and to the rear.

The application site is positioned among a collection of predominantly terraced and semi-detached houses; each property displays unique characteristics.

The properties are generally set back from the road, with driveways and gardens at the front. The site is slightly sloped, resulting in varying ridge heights.

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	• KDP1 of the SPD • Policy LP24 Design (a) and (c) of the KLP • Chapter 12 NPPF	The proposed additions would introduce some change to the dwellings overall appearance. The front extension and dormers would be modest and proportionate. The rear extension, although relatively deep, benefits from prior approval and could be implemented independently. The rear dormer would be visible from surrounding viewpoints and would appear somewhat bulky; however, a dormer of comparable scale could be constructed under permitted development. As such, while there would be some limited visual harm, it would not be so significant as to conflict with Policy LP24 of the Kirklees Local Plan. In terms of materiality, the proposal would be constructed using materials to match the proposed finishing of the dwelling and would be in keeping with the character of the site. In terms of the appearance and local character of the street scene, the proposed extension is considered acceptable.	✓

Impact on original house	• 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, as such, the additions in all would appear subservient in scale. The proposed materials would ensure the extensions integrate acceptably with the host dwelling.	✓
Height, scale and massing	• KDP 1 and 2 of the SPD • Policy LP24 Design (a), (c) and (d) of the KLP • Chapter 12 of the NPPF	The extension would project across the front and rear of the property. The proposed front extensions would be of an appropriate scale, height and mass as not to dominate the principal elevation. Both the rear extension and dormer window benefit from PD fallback positions and are therefore considered acceptable in this instance.	✓
Facing materials and detailing	• KDP 9 of the SPD • Policy LP24 Design (d) (iii) of the KLP • Chapter 12 of the NPPF	Facing materials to match proposed finishing of the entire dwelling.	✓
Roof style	• KDP 1 and 2 of the SPD • Policy LP24 Design (a), (c) and (d) of the KLP • Chapter 12 of the NPPF	Pitched and lean-to roof style at the front – acceptable. Flat and pitched roof style to rear – acceptable for the reasons outlined above.	✓
Window proportions	• KDP 1 and 2 of the SPD	Small scale windows would be in-keeping with existing building.	✓

	• Policy LP24 Design (a), (c) and (d) of the KLP • Chapter 12 of the NPPF		
Accessibility for all users	• KDP 17 of the SPD • Policy LP24 Design (f) • Chapter 12 of the NPPF	Private domestic extension.	✓

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: Are the considerations in the following table acceptable?

The main properties affected are:

- 1 and 3 Alpine Close – these properties are the adjoining terraced dwelling. Given that the number one sits on a higher topographical level and number 5 sits at a lower topographical level, it is considered that there will be some impact in terms of light and outlook. However, a notification for an enlarged dwelling was advertised under application 2025/ 90449 and as a result of this application, no representations were received. No representations for this application have been received either. It is material to note that the applicant benefits from prior approval consent (prior approval not required) for a rear extension of the same scale now proposed, which establishes a realistic fallback position. This extension could therefore be implemented under permitted development rights irrespective of the outcome of the current application. Therefore, there is a permitted development fall back position, which is afforded significant weight in the assessment.

The erection of dormers will not impact these properties as they face the front and rear amenity area of the application site. They will not be overbearing on numbers 1 & 3. As such, no impact in terms of loss of light, outlook and privacy.

The front dormers are unlikely to cause any significant harm in terms of residential amenity of the adjoining properties given the level at which the works would be sited. The sloped nature of the applicant site and the position within the existing roof is such that there would be no overshadowing.

The front extension will not impact these properties given that it does not extend beyond the front building line of these properties.

- Having considered the above factors, the proposals are not considered to result in any adverse impact upon the residential amenity of any surrounding neighbouring occupants.
- There are properties immediately to the front however, given the distance between the application site and properties to the front, there will be no impact on these properties.
- There are no properties immediately to the rear of the application site.

	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)	• 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)	• KDP 4, 5, 6 of the SPD • Policy LP24 Design (b) • Chapter 12 of the NPPF	As above.	✓
Remaining garden space of application property	• KDP 7 of the SPD • Policy LP24 Design (b) and (c) • Chapter 12 of the NPPF	The proposed rear extension would impact the rear garden space, however the remaining quantity would be sufficient and commensurate to the scale of the resultant dwelling.	✓

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	• KDP 15 of the SPD • Policy LP22 Parking (f) of the KLP • Chapter 12 of the NPPF	Parking is predominantly provided in curtilage and on street, which remains acceptable due to the location of this property and the neighbouring houses.	✓
Parking provision	• KDP 15 of the SPD • Policy LP22 Parking (f) of the KLP • Chapter 12 of the NPPF	Maintains appropriate access and off-street parking.	✓
Provision for waste storage	• 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	• KDP 13 of the SPD • Policy LP24 Design (d) (i) (iv) Policy LP33 Trees • Chapter 12 of the NPPF	N/A	✓
Impact on ecology	• KDP 12 of the SPD • Policy LP30	N/A	✓

	Chapter 15 of the NPPF		
Carbon Budget / Climate change statement	- 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	- 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:

No representations received.

Conclusion:

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

This application has been assessed against relevant policies in the development plan and other material considerations. It is considered that the development would constitute sustainable development and is therefore recommended for approval.

Recommendation: **CONDITIONAL FULL PERMISSION**

Decision Authorisation - Delegated Powers

Application Number: 2025/91652

Officer Recommendation: Approve

Conditions and Reasons

1. The development hereby permitted shall be begun within three years of the date of this permission.

Reason: Pursuant to the requirements of Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in complete accordance with the plans and specifications schedule listed in this decision notice, except as may be specified in the conditions attached to this permission, which shall in all cases take precedence.

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt as to what is being permitted and to accord with Policies LP01, LP02, LP21, LP22 & LP24 of the Kirklees Local Plan, Principles 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11 & 15 of the Council's adopted House Extensions & Alterations Supplementary Planning Document and Policies within Chapters 2, 9, 12 and 14 of the National Planning Policy Framework

3. The external walls and roofing materials of the development hereby approved shall in all respects match those used in the construction of the existing building.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity and in accordance with Policies LP01, LP02 & LP24 of the Kirklees Local Plan, Principles 1 and 2 the Council's adopted House Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document and policies within Chapter 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Plans and specifications schedule:-

Plan Type	Reference	Version	Date Received
Location Plan	24321-D01-A Location Plan		17/06/2025
Grouped Plans and Elevations	24321-D02-A Grouped Plans		17/06/2025
General	Climate Change Statement		18/06/2025

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: 07/10/2025