

KIRKLEES METROPOLITAN COUNCIL INVESTMENT & REGENERATION SERVICE

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT

**Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England)
Order 2015 - Schedule 2, Part 1, Class A.1 (g) Condition A.4**

DELEGATED DECISION FOR DISCHARGE OF CONDITION A.4 - NOTIFICATION OF A PROPOSED ENLARGEMENT TO DWELLINGHOUSE

Reference no.	2026/HH/91523/E
Site Address	21, Clarke Street, Westborough, Dewsbury, WF13 4LP
Description	The proposal is for erection of single storey rear extension. The extension projects 6m 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
Recommending Officer	Joshua Merriman

DECISION – PRIOR APPROVAL REQUIRED AND REFUSED

**I hereby authorise the refusal 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: 09-Jul-2026

By virtue of the projection, size and scale of the development, the single storey extension would lead to an unacceptable impact upon the amenity of adjoining neighbouring occupiers due to resultant overshadowing created by the single storey extension.

As a result of the projection, size and scale of the development, the single storey extension would lead to an oppressive and overbearing feature which would have a harmful impact in relation to the outlook from adjoining neighbouring properties. The resultant impact would have a detrimental impact upon the amenity of neighbouring occupiers.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION

DISCHARGE OF CONDITION A.4 , SCHEDULE 2, PART 1, CLASS A GENERAL PERMITTED DEVELOPMENT ORDER

1. Procedural Matters

Prior notifications for the erection of single storey rear extensions to dwellings are considered against the requirements as set out by the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development)(England) Order 2015 (as amended) Schedule 2, Part 1, Class A, condition A.4.

Proposals pursuant to Class A are permitted subject to limitations set out in paragraph A.1 and in the case of Class A.1 (g) subject to the discharge of condition A.4. This proposal relates to development pursuant to Class A where condition A.4 is engaged and for the purposes of this assessment only the limitations for Class A.1 (g) and requirements condition A.4 are considered. Other limitations within Class A are not considered other than where, in the opinion of the Local Planning Authority, the development does not comply with the limitations within Class A of the Order. Ultimately the responsibility to ensure the development is carried out in full accordance with any planning permission rests with the applicant or property owner/occupier.

Limitations for Class A.1(g) Development

Is the site within a Conservation Area, Article 4 or SSI area?	No
Is any part of the proposal clearly outside the curtilage of the dwellinghouse?	No
If the house is detached and from the information submitted, does the extension extend more than 8 metres from the rear of the original dwellinghouse?	N/A
If the house is not detached and from the information submitted, does the	No

extension extend more than 6 metres from the rear of the original dwellinghouse?	
Does the proposal exceed 4 metres in height?	No
Have permitted development rights been removed from the property?	No

Condition A.4

As part of the notification procedure, the Local Planning Authority notify owners or occupiers of adjacent premises of the proposed development by serving notice and allowing 21 days for objections to be made. The Local Authority shall take into account any representations made as a result of the notice given.

Consultation start date : 8th June 2026

Consultation end date : 29th June 2026

1. Objections

Summary of representations:

- The scale and depth of the proposed extension would introduce a substantial and visually dominant form of development to the rear of the terraced row, appearing as a prominent and intrusive structure when viewed from neighbouring properties.
- The extension would obstruct existing views.
- The proposal would reduce the sense of openness currently enjoyed, resulting in an overbearing and visually intrusive development.
- The extension would be significantly larger than other rearward projections in the area, appearing out of keeping with the scale and character of surrounding properties.
- The extension is significantly greater in height than the existing boundary fence, therefore, creating a pronounced 'walling effect' when viewed from adjoined dwellings.
- The proposal would cause overshadowing and loss of light to the rear elevations and gardens of neighbouring properties.

2. Assessment

The property does not have an existing rearward projection and lies within a terraced row of twelve properties, of which only three have erected rearward projections. There are also three outbuildings erected to the rear of properties within the terraced row.

As objections have been received against the development, an assessment of the proposals impacts upon amenity must be undertaken.

Given the siting of the extension, being set against the shared boundary between No. 21 and No. 23, and being only slightly set in from the shared boundary with No.19, it is considered that an extension projecting 6m from the rear elevation of the existing property would cause significant levels of overshadowing and loss of light upon adjoining properties.

Any habitable windows in the rear elevation of adjoining properties are considered to be impacted as a result of an unacceptable level of overshadowing and loss of light. The proposed rear extension is also considered to have an unacceptable overbearing impact upon neighbouring properties, as it stands significantly taller than the existing shared boundary treatments and would significantly reduce outlook from immediately neighbouring dwellings.

Considering the above assessment, the proposal would have unacceptable impacts upon neighbouring dwellings and thus cannot be supported

Representations Received

- The scale and depth of the proposed extension would introduce a substantial and visually dominant form of development to the rear of the terraced row, appearing as a prominent and intrusive structure when viewed from neighbouring properties.
- The proposal would reduce the sense of openness currently enjoyed, resulting in an overbearing and visually intrusive development.
- The extension would be significantly larger than other rearward projections in the area, appearing out of keeping with the scale and character of surrounding properties.
- The extension is significantly greater in height than the existing boundary fence, therefore, creating a pronounced 'walling effect' when viewed from adjoining dwellings.
- The proposal would cause overshadowing and loss of light to the rear elevations and gardens of neighbouring properties.

Officer Comment: This has been addressed within the 'Assessment' section of this report.

- The extension would obstruct existing views.

Officer Comment: Whilst impact upon outlook is a planning matter which is accounted for in the 'Assessment' section of this report, the impact upon views does not constitute a planning matter to which weight could be afforded in this case.

3. Recommendation

By virtue of the projection, size and scale of the development, the single storey extension would lead to an unacceptable impact upon the amenity of adjoining neighbouring occupiers due to resultant overshadowing created by the single storey extension.

As a result of the projection, size and scale of the development, the single storey extension would lead to an oppressive and overbearing feature which would have a harmful impact in relation to the outlook from adjoining neighbouring properties. The resultant impact would have a detrimental impact upon the amenity of neighbouring occupiers.