

Planning Services,
Kirklees MBC,
PO Box B93
Civic Centre 3,
Huddersfield,
HD1 2JR

19th October 2018

Dear

Application No: 2018/93228 - Erection of Two Store Side Extension - 10 Quarry Court, Longwood, HD3 4UQ

, I have carefully studied the above application and site plans and it is apparent to me that certain details contained therein are misleading. I would, therefore, object to this planning application and request a site visit by Kirklees Planning Services. My reasonings for this request are as follows: -

Measurements and Proximity of the Proposed Works to

Currently, the width of the footpath of number 10, , is estimated as 90 centimetres. The proposed increase in the width of no.10 to the eastern side (i.e. the kitchen extension further east of the existing garage line of no.10) would reduce the distance between the two properties to a few centimetres. This distance would not be sufficient to allow the building of retaining walls, as suggested by builder. The construction of such retaining walls is imperative to stabilise the driveway and garden border of and avoid any landslip or collapse

The boundary between the two properties is not the wooden fence but the small vertical stones erected by the builder in 1993. In actual fact, one of the gateposts erected by the owners of , is wholly situated on the land owned by . It was expedient to allow this erection at the time, as no further encroachment was imagined or requested.

The application does not include any of the above information, nor does it make clear the near impossible practicalities of constructing this extension to the side elevation of no.10 in such close proximity to, and alongside the frontage of the principal elevation

Excavations

It was found essential by the builders and surveyors involved in the 1993 building of , that the house and garage of be constructed on separate foundation platforms in view of the proximity to the south side precipice and the potential risk of landslip to the rear.

My view of the planned works would surmise that to construct a permanent and secure raised patio to the rear and side of no.10 would entail excavation within a metre of, and depth of approximately two metres below the foundations of the garage of . The practicalities of such works are not mentioned in the application and there is no detail of any Health & Safety issues.

Continued/

I must emphasise that the amount of excavation needed to lay foundations at the side extension of no.10, would run the width of the principal elevation of _____ and at the same two metre depth. The impracticalities of such works are not addressed in the application and there is no detail of any Health and Safety concerns.

I would recommend that the applicant employs the services of a surveyor and initiates the Party Wall Act.

Principal Elevation

_____ is the only dwelling on Quarry Court with a principal elevation facing to the side of another property. All others have road facing principal elevations to the front.

The construction of the proposed extension to no. 10 will have an enormous impact on _____, whose principal elevation and front door would open to a blank two storey wall only a few metres away, blocking light and a view of the local area, which was an intentional visual amenity when the Quarry Court development was planned circa 1990.

Impact and Residential Amenity

Quarry Court was carefully planned to enhance the appearance, from near and far, of the old quarry and Longwood Edge hillside. All the houses were designed with a considered symmetry to each other, with appropriate gaps to provide a visual amenity across the valley from dwellings on both sides of the road. This can be confirmed, when viewed from the Golcar area. The whole development was considered an enhancement to the Longwood area and any radical changes would affect more than the Quarry Court residents.

The proposed no.10 extension would close _____ open space between the two dwellings.
_____. The uniformity and planning of the whole development would disappear.

The principal elevation of _____ would appear cramped and dominated by this two storey extension, contrary to the original plans for the Court and surrounding area. It would not blend with the rest of the development.

Permitted Development Rights were removed from all properties, indicating that there was definite intent to preserve the design of the whole of Quarry Court. As there have been no other side extensions (or, indeed, any extensions) in the 30 years since building commenced, I am of the opinion that status quo should prevail and this application refused.

Conclusion

For the reasons stated above, I would be totally against the approval of this application. In addition, it is highly unlikely that the extension could be constructed within the parameters of the land owned by no.10,
_____. I question the whole feasibility of this application.

The increased proximity of the proposed extension to _____, would have a considerable, negative effect on the daily use of _____. The raised level of no. 10's footpath along _____ boundary and principal elevation, plus the absence of screening, would certainly affect the privacy of _____ together with a loss of light and vista.

The plans may look credible on paper but the reality is much different. I would therefore ask that a site visit by Kirklees Planning Services be arranged at your early convenience.

Yours sincerely,