

## PLANNING, DESIGN & HERITAGE STATEMENT

### Revised Two-Storey Extension

41 Batley Field Hill, Upper Batley, Batley, WF17 0BE

---

#### 1. Introduction

This Planning, Design and Heritage Statement has been prepared in support of a revised planning application for a two-storey extension at 41 Batley Field Hill, Upper Batley, Batley, WF17 0BE.

The property lies within the administrative area of Kirklees Council and is recognised as a **non-designated heritage asset** due to its distinctive and well-preserved Art Deco architectural character.

This submission responds directly to the refusal of application 2025/62/93351/E and demonstrates how the revised proposal:

- Preserves the character and significance of the non-designated heritage asset
  - Achieves clear subservience
  - Respects proportions, symmetry and simplicity
  - Complies with Policies LP24 and LP35 of the Kirklees Local Plan
  - Aligns with the House Extensions & Alterations SPD
  - Meets the objectives of Chapters 12 and 15 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)
- 

#### 2. Heritage-Style Architectural Analysis

##### 2.1 Architectural Typology and Significance

The host dwelling is an early–mid 20th century Art Deco influenced domestic property. While not statutorily listed, it possesses local architectural significance derived from:

- Strong geometric composition
- Emphasis on horizontal banding
- Flat / shallow roof forms with parapet expression
- Smooth rendered elevations
- Controlled, vertically proportioned fenestration
- Visual symmetry and façade discipline

Its significance is not ornamental but compositional. The building's value lies in its clarity of form, proportional restraint and cohesive architectural language.

---

## **2.2 Contribution to Local Character**

Within Batley Field Hill, architectural styles vary; however, this dwelling stands out due to:

- Its coherent Art Deco form
- Its clean rendered façade
- Its strong architectural identity

As a non-designated heritage asset, its significance is primarily architectural rather than associative or communal. The building's importance rests in the survival of its stylistic integrity.

---

## **2.3 Key Elements of Significance**

The elements that contribute most strongly to its significance include:

1. Primary symmetrical massing
2. Horizontal emphasis across elevations
3. Simplicity of roof profile
4. Balanced solid-to-void ratio
5. Minimalist detailing

Any extension must therefore:

- Maintain clarity of hierarchy
  - Avoid competing roof forms
  - Respect established horizontal datums
  - Preserve visual simplicity
- 

## **3. Assessment of Impact (Heritage Impact Assessment Approach)**

In accordance with Chapter 16 of the NPPF (Conserving and Enhancing the Historic Environment), great weight is given to the conservation of designated assets; for non-designated assets, paragraph 209 requires balanced judgement having regard to the scale of harm and the significance of the asset.

### **3.1 Previous Scheme**

The refused scheme was considered to introduce:

- Excessive massing
- Insufficient subservience
- Competing roof form
- Fenestration that disrupted compositional balance

This was judged to result in harm to the character and significance of the non-designated heritage asset.

---

### **3.2 Revised Scheme – Heritage Response**

The revised proposal has been carefully reduced and rebalanced to ensure:

- Clear volumetric hierarchy
- Reduced projection and footprint
- Lowered visual mass
- Simplified roof expression
- Fenestration aligned with existing datums
- Improved proportional relationship to the host dwelling

The extension now reads as a secondary addition that defers to the architectural primacy of the original structure.

---

### **3.3 Level of Harm**

The revised scheme results in:

- **No harm** to the identified elements of significance
- Preservation of compositional balance
- Retention of the building's distinctive Art Deco character

The proposal therefore preserves the character and significance of the non-designated heritage asset in accordance with national and local policy.

---

## **4. Design Response to Refusal Reasons**

### **4.1 Subservience and Massing**

The revised extension:

- Is set back from the principal elevation
- Is reduced in scale
- Maintains a lower visual hierarchy
- Avoids dominance

The extension is now clearly legible as a subordinate form.

---

## **4.2 Roof Form**

The roof design has been simplified to ensure:

- It does not compete with the primary roof profile
- It reinforces the horizontal architectural emphasis
- It avoids introducing awkward visual bulk

The roof now supports the host building's geometry rather than undermining it.

---

## **4.3 Fenestration**

Fenestration has been refined to:

- Align with horizontal datums
- Maintain vertical emphasis characteristic of the property
- Preserve façade rhythm
- Avoid over-glazing

The revised approach reinforces architectural coherence.

---

## **5. Kirklees Local Plan Policy Compliance**

The proposal has been assessed against the adopted Kirklees Local Plan.

### **Policy LP24 – Design**

Policy LP24 requires development to:

- (a) Be of high quality design
- (b) Respect local character
- (c) Contribute positively to visual amenity
- (d) Respond to scale, proportion and massing

The revised scheme complies with LP24 as it:

- Demonstrates proportionate scale
  - Preserves architectural integrity
  - Achieves subservience
  - Enhances design coherence
- 

### **Policy LP35 – Non-Designated Heritage Assets**

Policy LP35 requires development affecting non-designated heritage assets to:

- Conserve their significance
- Avoid harm to character
- Be supported by proportionate heritage assessment

This submission provides that assessment and demonstrates that the revised extension preserves the dwelling's architectural significance.

---

### **House Extensions & Alterations SPD**

The scheme complies with:

- **KDP1** – Scale and Subsistence
- **KDP2** – Design and Materials

The extension is subordinate, visually balanced, and architecturally sympathetic.

---

### **6. National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)**

The proposal aligns with:

- **Chapter 12** – Achieving well-designed places
- **Chapter 16** – Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

The revised scheme:

- Reflects local character
- Maintains architectural integrity
- Preserves a non-designated heritage asset

No harm arises that would require balancing public benefits.

---

### **7. Conclusion**

The earlier refusal identified concerns relating to dominance, scale and impact upon the non-designated heritage asset.

The revised proposal has:

- Reduced scale and massing
- Restored proportional clarity
- Simplified roof form that follows the horizontal form and existing roof characteristics
- Refined fenestration
- Reinforced architectural hierarchy

The scheme now preserves the character and significance of the non-designated heritage asset and complies with Policies LP24 and LP35 of the Kirklees Local Plan, the House Extensions & Alterations SPD, and Chapters 12 and 16 of the NPPF.

Planning permission is therefore respectfully requested.