Search application details

Application number: 2026/62/92154/E	
What is the application for?:	Removal of existing garage and erection of two storey side extension with porch,
Address of the site or building:	12, Birch Grove, Batley, WF17 0RQ
Postcode:	WF17 0RQ

User comments

Type of comment: A supporting comment	
Do you wish your comments to be published on the website anonymously?	Yes

I have reviewed the further objection and wish to correct a number of points.

Light, outlook and “views”
The proposal should be assessed against the actual submitted plans, dimensions and orientation of the properties. A private view is not something that planning normally protects; the relevant considerations are whether there would be an unacceptable impact on daylight, sunlight or residential outlook. Those matters should be assessed objectively by the Planning Officer rather than on descriptions such as “blocking all views” or assumptions about the effect of the extension.

500mm separation and neighbouring guttering
The suggestion that the proposed separation is effectively reduced to only a few centimetres because of the neighbouring guttering is misleading. My architect and structural engineer have confirmed that the neighbouring gutter/eaves currently project across the boundary into the land of No.12. That existing projection should not be treated as defining the lawful extent of the neighbouring property or as reducing the separation shown on my submitted plans.

Maintenance of No.10
Concerns about cleaning gutters, repointing brickwork, painting balcony railings or carrying out future maintenance are private property/maintenance matters. They do not determine whether the proposed development is acceptable in planning terms.

Solar panels/security equipment
The objection refers to possible reduction in light to small solar panels used for security equipment and other garden solar panels. These are ancillary private installations and should not override an otherwise acceptable residential development. Any genuine daylight or overshadowing impact should instead be assessed against the normal planning tests.

Privacy and overlooking
The proposal should be judged from the actual position and orientation of the proposed

The proposal should be judged from the actual position and orientation of the proposed windows. It should not be assumed that the extension will automatically create unacceptable overlooking. I remain willing to accept reasonable measures, including obscure glazing where the Planning Officer considers it necessary.

Garage removal, boundary and construction works
The suggestion that removing the garage may cause damage is a construction matter and will be dealt with through the appropriate structural and, where applicable, Party Wall procedures. Appropriate boundary protection can also be provided following demolition. The neighbour's safety arrangements for children do not require the permanent retention of my existing garage.

Parking
The assertion that parking facilities are being removed without replacement is incorrect. The completed property will retain substantial off-street parking through the undercroft/driveway area, separate side parking and further garage provision, with capacity for approximately 3–4 vehicles.

I respectfully ask that the application is determined on the actual planning merits of the proposal, rather than assumptions about private views, maintenance arrangements, temporary construction matters, existing parking elsewhere on Birch Grove or a neighbouring gutter projection into No.12.