

2nd March 2019

Dear Sir / Madam,

RE: Planning Application **2019/90269**

We are writing to you to object to the above planning proposal.

The top part of Ford Drive which is owned by granted to I believe in turn we have 'drainage rights' over these properties in order that our waste water can run through the drains owned by the other properties.

On the visual pack and documents submitted there are a number of areas which are overlooked or simply not represented on the documents or drawings.

We are objecting to a number of points and have broken it down below.

Principle

The current property is a mature house with a double garage and parking area which is the proposed area for development. The garage is currently a single storey or looks out of place on the current properties on Stocks Bank Road.

The plan is to demolish the garage and replace with a large house deemed a bungalow on the planning application when in fact it is a one and half storey house with a large footprint.

While the building is not as high as the surrounding houses it will still have a significant visual impact as it will be squeezed into plot and the space around buildings will be very little.

The impact the building will have on ourselves and other surrounding properties will be massive. The actual size of the property planned is larger than any of the surrounding properties and will be fit on a smaller area of land.

There are several references in the current application made to a previous planning application which was refused by the planning committee and also a subsequent appeal.

Overlooking

The planned property is to [redacted] which is claimed as non-habitable in the planning application yet was viewed as habitable by the Appeal Officer in the previous refused application, will be looking out on a brick wall and the entrance door of the [redacted]. Despite being set back the proposed property's entrance will be 9 metres away and the brick wall less than 6 metres away. There are three roof windows in the property [redacted].

The opposite side of the property will be built with no more than a path's width between [redacted] and the [redacted].

Overbearing

The footprint of the proposed property is even larger than the previously rejected application and it is classed as a bungalow however it still retains a second floor. The previous application was rejected due to the proximity of the [redacted].

The actual footprint of the proposed development is almost a quarter larger than the previous application and is still being fit into the same plot.

The drawings also fail to show a path alongside [redacted] narrows the drive. On the block plan showing the surrounding ours, the patio is shown and used in the calculations of size of buildings as well. [redacted]. This was an extension to the original property by a previous owner which was agreed with neighbours after a larger extension had been refused planning for being too large.

Road Safety and Access

No access will be given to Ford Drive as it is a privately owned drive. This will include any site vehicles which need access. The road where the property will be situated has double yellow lines on both sides of the road and there is no parking for site or delivery vehicles. The road itself is close to a T junction which is on a bus route. There are already problems when two buses meet at this junction with one of them having to reverse up. The junction makes it very difficult to see approaching traffic and this will not be helped by any additional parked vehicles. We currently have problems with delivery vehicles etc, [redacted], as the path is quite wide. These problems are primarily with the views of approaching traffic on Stocks Bank Road and can make exiting Ford Drive hazardous.

This planning application has moved the front of the property closer to Stocks Bank Road which limits the space for parking. Hopefully a site visit will take place and please review the space at the front of the existing No 93 with a view to parking and manoeuvring three cars to understand the limited space.

Calderdale planning regulations being 9m is irrelevant as it is well within Kirklees boundaries as and such that is Policy BE12.

There is reference to the existing garage structure not being overbearing, which would be the case if the proportions of the garage were not be extended as they will be in the plan and as such the front wall of the garage will be moved in front of our kitchen window and the roof height will almost double. The 'modest pitched' roof will be the primary outlook from the kitchen window.

It refers to the offset of 9.7m from while this is true of some of the elevation, most will be less than 6m, either way these fall short of the 12m suggested in Policy BE12.

Without a full year of assessing the sunlight or overshadowing it is a dubious comment to say we will not loose sunlight or be overshadowed at **ANY** time. As the property is larger than the existing properties I cannot see this will be the case at all times of the year.

The comment of **NO** overbearing is not true, as the proposed large development will be close enough to have a significant impact

The documents referring to the elevation are also incorrect as instead of two windows in the existing garage elevation, there will be three windows in the main block of the house including bedroom windows

Regards,