

About the application

Application number: 2018/93293	
What is the application for?:	Erection of single storey front and rear extensions and dormer
Address of the site or building:	2, Squirrel Hall Drive, Dewsbury, WF13 4AH
Postcode:	WF13 4AH

User comments

Type of comment: An objection
The planning application form is incorrectly filled in. In item 6, trees and hedges the no box has been ticked for trees and hedges within falling distance of the proposed application. The adjoining north (rear) boundary consists of a small wall, with to the rear of that wall conifer bushes which are approximately 15 metres high. In fact they have caused structural damage to the small brick boundary wall with the roots having displaced the wall causing it to crack and move. Secondly under parking the no box has been ticked for affecting parking. I have seen vehicles parked to the rear of the existing property on several occasions. This will not be possible under the proposal. There is no finish stated for original or proposed materials under item 5. A number of very important points which must be looked at and considered very carefully by planning arise from having no clear indication of what materials are to be used. These points are in regard to the visual and structural integrity of both the proposed and original structures due in no small part to the over large proposed construction. It must be remembered that when you walk down Cullingworth street and turn into Squirrel Hall under the proposed application you will be confronted with a property that is twice the size of all the others and consists of new - old - new in appearance. Firstly. The original property was built using imperial bricks. These are 12mm larger in height and 17mm longer than the modern metric bricks. This impacts in the following way. There are approx 28 courses of brick from ground to eaves level, plus whatever is below ground. This means a 336 mm difference in height between the old and new bricks above ground level. This difference has to 'lost' and as far as I can see there are only 2 ways this can be done. First the new bricks can be 'bedded up' to match the original course heights but this will mean the bed joints on the new work will be 25mm plus deep. This is not acceptable both visually and structurally, especially as the original building will be sandwiched between the new brickwork to the front and rear .Both the bed joints and the bricks between old and new will not form a continual course line causing a large visual clash between the two. not to mention the possible mish mash of colours and

textures if a good match of brick is not chosen/specified.

The other option, if indeed it is an option at all, is to 'bed down' and try to lose the difference by introducing more courses. This, again, would result a visual clash causing an unacceptable appearance to the property.

Both solutions- (and I use the term solutions loosely as the only really practical solution is to use bricks that are both dimensionally and visually equal to the originals), are not going to produce an acceptable appearance on such a large proposed structure especially as the proposal is to both the front and rear of the original.

Another issue raised is the following. As the proposal intends to remove the front and rear walls of the original construction therefore effectively reducing the stability of the remaining walls great consideration must be given to the junction of the old and new to ensure this stability is returned. The bond between the existing and new foundations, brick and blockwork must be first class to ensure the stability of both structures.

The quality of this bond will be determined by the brick/block used and the quality of the work carried out.

As far as I can see the side wall of number 2 forms the boundary with number 4. This means traditional strip foundations can not be used as they can not be constructed within the boundary line of number 2.

In summary my objection is based on the fact that the proposal is far too large for the site. It is not a small extension to one face where differences in materials cause minimum visual disruption and do not detract so much from the host construction, hence the area maintains it's visual integrity which is paramount to good planning.

This proposal is virtually another house constructed around the existing one and as such is not an extension but an over-build of the existing property. It is fraught with both visual and constructional problems which will destroy the visual integrity of the area.