



Urban Future Planning Consultancy Ltd
14 King Street
Leeds
LS1 2HL

10th February 2026

Planning Department
Kirklees Council
Civic Centre 3
Market Street
Huddersfield
HD1 2EY

Dear Sir / Madam

Resubmission of LPA ref no. 2025/62/92629/E (12 Cawley Lane, Heckmondwike, WF16 0BJ) Extensions and alterations to Dwelling

Please find enclosed documents to accompany a planning application on behalf of S Alyas, seeking consent for extensions and alterations at 12 Cawley Lane, Heckmondwike, WF16 0BJ.

12 Cawley Lane is a detached property with a render finish. The dwelling is double fronted in appearance with the principal elevation facing away from the road. The road facing elevation has a projecting element which forms the staircase for the property. The dwelling has a detached garage to the side with a drive to the roadside of the property and a larger, enclosed garden to the opposite elevation. The properties surrounding vary in terms of palette of materials, age and size.

Planning consent was granted on 1st December 2025 (LPA ref no. 2025/62/92629/E) to extend the dwelling house.

The Applicant has since revisited the proposals and seeks to slightly amend the approved scheme. The proposed minor modifications comprise adjusting the proposed front gable elevation forward by 200mm whilst removing the set back of the side extension. The accompanying plans fully demonstrate the intended minor alterations and should be referred to further details.



Figure 1. The minor amendments involve the front elevation

The atrium glazed front entrance was deemed acceptable during the previous application as it is of a design rationale that seeks to create an open, inviting entrance, a transitional space between the indoors and the front garden. This element of the scheme will notably increase levels of natural light throughout the application property and is considered to increase the property's aesthetic appeal. By moving the front glass elevation 200mm forward from the approved drawing, it would retain its approved height, depth, and overall massing of the extensions. The minor amendment is largely geometric and would not materially increase scale / perceived bulk.

The accompanying plans fully demonstrate the proposed variation and should be referred to for further details.

The scheme also involves removing the set back of the side extension to result in a 'cleaner and more coherent' elevation that respects the proportions of the host dwelling. The current setback is causing structural issues due to the amount of upper load concentrated at the corner. As such,

the Applicant seeks to make the side extension flush and spread the load across the new structure.

Although the side extension is flush with the main building line, the existing front extensions mean that it still appears visually set back when viewed from the front, maintaining a subordinate and balanced appearance in line with the character of the dwelling and street.

The removal of the setback and adjustment to the front glass elevation do not materially affect neighbouring amenity. The changes do not result in an increase in height or depth beyond the approved scheme and so would not result in additional overlooking, loss of privacy, or overshadowing to the detriment of neighbouring amenity.

The original part of the house would continue to be the main feature of interest. The applicant points to other extensions in the area of a similar nature i.e. without a setback such as at 5 Harewood Avenue, where consent was granted in 2022 for a side extension without a setback or set-down. The Case Officer's comments are noted:

Two storey side extension

The scale of the side extension is considered acceptable as it allows the original house to remain the dominant element. Although it would be preferable to have a setback and set down, there are other extensions in the area so this would not be out of place. The materials proposed would match the main house and the detailing is considered acceptable. The side extension is, therefore, considered to be acceptable in terms of visual amenity.

The bungalow opposite at No. 2 Foster Drive also feature a side extension that is not set back.

Paragraph 4.2 of the House Extensions & Alterations SPD states that “the local context, character and identity of the area will be a significant factor in determining the appropriate form and scale of alterations”. Paragraph 4.6 states “where extensions seek to differ from the existing materials, design, roof pitch or detailing, proposals will be considered on a case-by-case basis.

On balance, the minor changes would have a negligible impact on the character and appearance of the host property and that of the surrounding area and are considered to accord with Policy LP24 of the Kirklees Local Plan, Key Design Principles of the House Extensions & Alterations SPD and

the aims of the National Planning Policy Framework and I look forward to confirmation of this during the course of the assessment.

The proposed amendments to remove the setback on the side extension and move the front glass elevation forward represent logical and reasonable design improvements. They do not increase scale, harm neighbouring amenity, or detract from the character of the area.

The proposed minor amendments have been carefully designed taking into consideration scale, form, and relationship with neighbouring properties. It is noted that the proposed minor changes would not result in any significant increase in the overall scale or massing of the built form, and as such, the development is considered to remain proportionate and in keeping with the character of the existing property.

The proposal does not seek to reduce the separation distances between the host dwelling and the adjacent properties. The existing spatial relationships, including garden boundaries and building orientations, would be maintained. As a result, the development would not introduce any new opportunities for overlooking or a loss of privacy to the neighbouring occupiers. Similarly, the scale and siting of the proposed development would avoid any overbearing impact or sense of enclosure for neighbouring residents.

On this basis, in relation to the impact on the residential amenity of neighbouring occupants, the minor changes would be compliant with Policy LP24 c), which sets out that proposals should promote good design by, amongst other things, extensions minimising impact on residential amenity of future and neighbouring occupiers.

The works would also comply with The House Extensions & Alterations SPD which goes into further detail with respect to Key Design Principle 3 on privacy, Key Design Principle 5 on overshadowing/loss of light and Key Design Principle 6 on preventing overbearing impact.

Should you wish to discuss the proposals further, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Yours faithfully

Ms Nazia Shah MRTPI
Director



RTPI

Chartered Town Planners