
Dear All,

The Planning Sub-Committee (Huddersfield Area) will meet in the Council Chamber - Town Hall, Huddersfield at 1.00 pm on Thursday 19 March 2020.

I will not be attending the meeting due to fears over corona virus and also that planning have now done a complete u-turn in recommending approval of this application. As I stated before I know the applicant has reduced the height and configuration but I do not understand how a development which is twice the size of the current buildings on this plot is not seen as an over development. I am extremely disappointed that not one of the recipients to my previous emails has taken the time to respond to my last emails and the concerns I raised..

I feel so let down by a council and its representatives that have been elected on its promises **(Policy - 2018 under Housing – Extra Care)** are not ensuring that these promises are kept not only be the council but by all the departments within that council. How is it possible that the welfare of existing residents can be ignored over the grand plans of a developer? This is not a political statement but one that comes from a concerned resident

I would ask that all of my previous objections are still taken into consideration but also **ask the panel where will these developments stop?** I am now convinced that this is setting a precedent for bungalows to be bought for the sole purpose of developing into larger properties for a quick profit. I am aware that the bungalow next to this development is up for sale and the proprietors have already had a number of offers well below the asking price from individuals who are developers.

Who is going to monitor this development to ensure the developers abide by the conditions and that the developer does not exceed these last measurements provided?

Thank you all for your time in this matter and I hope all the objections will be considered and also ask why planning now deem this not to be an over development when both the proposed house and out building are twice the size of what is there now.

Subject: RE: HUDDERSFIELD PLANNING SUB-COMMITTEE 17th December 2019 Agenda Item 11

Good Afternoon,

I have now been advised that yet another set of plans have been submitted. I can see that the rear of the proposed plans have been amended in that the master bedroom now sits in a central position with single story either side (is this so it can then be extended at a later date?) However the depth of the proposed building is now longer! The garage is a significant size with an apex roof and measures 9 metres by 5 metres (out building / granny flat??) given the size of the plot this seems a little excessive.

Also I have been advised that planning department have commented as follows:-

“The latest revisions have been submitted in response to concerns being raised regarding the impact of the development on the occupants of 347. The scale and mass had been relocated to the opposite side. As a consequence the agent has moved the 2 storey element away from both boundaries in order to minimise any impact on either neighbour, this projects at 3 metres.

Amended plans have been sought as I note the discrepancy also. I will upload this but send a copy directly. It is my understanding that the **Location Plan is not showing the correct proposals.** Those shown on the block plan (garage plan) and the plans and elevations are correct.”

Also on the plans there is a new narrative

Details shown for planning purposes only.

Do not scale from this drawing. All

dimensions to be taken on site prior to installation.

What does this mean?

How are we supposed to review yet more plans when they are incorrect and seem to have a proviso that allows permission to be given for the plans without the correct measurements.

I am very concerned that plans will get approved and that there is no one to monitor and ensure that they are adhered to. Given the applicants track record of making amendments to pacify planning and then changing them, what assurances will planning give the other residents that these plans will not change again.

I am sure you are all as frustrated as we are, this has been going on far too long and is causing stress and anxiety and now affecting the quality of life that we lead. This whole process could have been avoided if local council policies (Labour Council manifesto policy 2018 under Housing – Extra Care) had been the same as local planning policies which would stop the demolition of bungalows for the profit of developers.

I appreciate you are all busy people but I would like a reply to my comments and concerns.

Kind regards

From:

Subject: RE: HUDDERSFIELD PLANNING SUB-COMMITTEE 17th December 2019 Agenda Item 11

Good Morning to you all ,

I have reviewed the updated plans submitted. I must admit I was a little surprised to see even more plans as I thought the application had been withdrawn as one of the measurements was wrong. Is Councillor Upall still proposing to bring this application to the March 2020 meeting? If not what has changed her mind that this application no longer needs to be discussed.

I am wary / mindful that the applicant has changed the plans that many times that they may indeed change again. Has the applicant reduced the measurement slightly knowing that there are thresholds and could therefore still go higher / bigger than any approval given?

What assurances are in place to ensure the new plans would be adhered to if planning decide to change the decision (which is currently rejected).

I would comment as follows and my objection to a demolish and rebuild or indeed to agree any over development still stands.

I note the applicant has now taken on board the fact that this project is an over development and that the plans have been scaled back slightly to reduce the height, remove the balcony and reduce the footprint. However I would still maintain that this is still an overdevelopment for the following reasons:-

Reasons for objections:-

1) It is in contravention of the Labour Council manifesto policy (2018 under Housing – Extra Care) which quotes

“We do not have homes that meet the needs of an ageing population, or for people with disabilities. We need to use all means at our disposal including land ownership or planning system to redress the balance”.

2) Change of scenery and street view removing a single storey bungalow and replacing with double story house (I note there are a mix of properties on Bradley Road but they are in blocks of similar type properties).

3) Potential to compromise the adjoining neighbours structure of the dividing wall and the rear of their house which adjoins the applicants driveway as they want to demolish the existing garage. Also what will happen to the current hedge that makes up the boundary? Hopefully this is staying insitu and would not be compromised by any demolition works.

4) Scale of the size of this development, which has continued to be amended since the current applicant bought the property. It started as a loft conversion to

accommodate two bedrooms, to a large extension and then a total demolition and rebuild with large Garage / Gym / Storeroom (previous recommendation was that the existing garage would remain). **Also who is going to monitor this project from planning given that the applicant has already made so many changes and has a proven record of ignoring planning advice in scaling back the development. Although the height is reduced on the plans due to the elevation of the land it will still appear quite a bit higher than the neighbouring properties.**

5) Impact on neighbours and the Bradley Road thoroughfare this scale of demolition and excavation is surely going to cause. It will be a disruption to neighbours, pedestrians and road users. Bradley road is now a very busy road, particularly at the start and end of the school day as All Saints is now such a large school lots of pupils use the Bradley Road Footpaths to walk home. Also there is additional traffic at the end of the school day when parents arrive to collect their children and park in the cycle lane right the way down to number 347. Rush hour traffic is at a standstill on most days along this stretch of Bradley Road.

6) It is contrary to Policy LP24 (a) and (b) of the Kirklees Local Plan and Chapter 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework **(this would need clarification from planning as this was one of their reasons for rejecting, has this now been complied with?)**

Regards

Subject: RE: HUDDERSFIELD PLANNING SUB-COMMITTEE 17th December 2019 Agenda Item 11

Good Afternoon,

Happy New year to you all.

Could you please review my email below as I do not appear to have had a reply. I would really like to understand why the measurements were incorrect and what they now are and I am struggling to see this clearly on the planning web site.

Subject: HUDDERSFIELD PLANNING SUB-COMMITTEE 17th December 2019 Agenda Item 11

Dear All,

As I could not attend the meeting yesterday I have viewed the minutes on line and note the application has been deferred. On speaking to attendees I believe this is due to the applicants representative requesting a deferral as some aspects of the measurements were incorrect. There have been so many changes and new plans submitted I think we are all at a loss as to what exactly is now being proposed.

Can I respectfully request that for the sake of transparency the measurements of the dimensions are made available prior to the next meeting to ensure all parties concerned are on an equal stance when presenting their cases. I have used the measuring tool but this is cumbersome and I am struggling to get an accurate measurement.

Once I have all the correct details I can then resubmit my objections for the next meeting as I will not be able to attend as I will be away.

Apologies for not including everyone on the first email. I hope this is now acceptable as I have included everyone one committee.

Dear Sirs,

The Planning Sub-Committee (Huddersfield Area) will meet in the Council Chamber - Town Hall, Huddersfield at 1.00 pm on Tuesday 17 December 2019.

I am contacting you not only for my own representation but on behalf of the neighbours who have already submitted objections on line. This case has been brought to committee by Councillor Harpreet Uppal (we assume at the request of the applicant) and we feel it only fair that there should be a representation on our behalf also.

We respectfully request without bias that the concerns of the residents who have made an objection to agenda point 11 are taken into account and that you as councillors who sit on the planning committee will review our concerns at the committee meeting.

The reason for the request is that the neighbouring residents are either unable to attend or are not confident enough to speak in public. In particular the neighbours either side of the proposed development who are retired pensioners (or soon to be retired) feel that they are not being represented or having their opinions considered as they are unable to speak in public.

This application has been on the go since early 2018 when it started out as a rather large extension. After several discussions with planning and immediate neighbours a conditional approval was granted. After twelve months of waiting to see if any works would commence a new planning application was submitted without any notification to the neighbours (previously applicant had discussed with neighbours their plans) to demolish and rebuild the bungalow that stands on this site.

The applicant has continued to ignore advice from the planning office to scale back on the plans, namely the height and size of the foot print of the proposed new structure and the addition and size of a new Garage/Gym/Storage construction.

The main objections have not been addressed / resolved as the new construction is still much larger than the property that currently occupies the site. Amended plans have been received. The plans address matters relating to the garage which has been reduced in size (although still substantial at 9m x 5m) however the amendments to the main dwelling do not overcome concerns.

Please also note comments on plans which especially note 1 which refers to Shop drawings? I have enclosed a snapshot as it is really small and you cannot make it out

NOTES:

1. CONTRACTORS AND SUB-CONTRACTORS MUST CHECK AND AGREE ALL DIMENSIONS BEFORE PREPARING SHOP DRAWINGS OR COMMENCING WORK ON SITE.
2. CONTRACTORS ARE RESPONSIBLE FOR INFORMING THE DESIGNER OF ANY DISCREPANCY DISCOVERED ON THIS DRAWING OR BETWEEN THIS DRAWING AND ANY OTHER RELATED DOCUMENTS WORK TO BE CARRIED OUT AS SHOWN ON THIS DRAWING.
3. WRITTEN DIMENSIONS ONLY ARE TO BE USED FROM THIS DRAWING—IF ANY DOUBTS EXIST—ASK FOR CLARIFICATION.

unless you magnify it.

Reasons for objections:-

- 1) It is in contravention of the Labour Council manifesto policy (2018 under Housing – Extra Care) which quotes
“We do not have homes that meet the needs of an ageing population, or for people with disabilities. We need to use all means at our disposal including land ownership or planning system to redress the balance”.
- 2) It is contrary to Policy LP24 (a) and (b) of the Kirklees Local Plan and Chapter 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework.
- 3) Potential to compromise the adjoining neighbours structure of the dividing wall and the rear of their house which adjoins the applicants driveway, as the new

plans state that the ground floor level will be lowered by half a metre. Presumably this is going to involve some excavation. Given the size of the footprint how much earth is going to be removed and will it extend beyond the footprint of the main house?

- 4) Scale of the size of this development, which has continued to be amended since the current applicant bought the property. It started as a loft conversion to accommodate two bedrooms, to a large extension and then a total demolition and rebuild with a balcony and with a large Garage / Gym / Storeroom.
- 5) Impact on neighbours and the Bradley Road thoroughfare this scale of demolition and excavation is surely going to cause. It will be a disruption to neighbours, pedestrians and road users. Bradley road is now a very busy road, particularly at the start and end of the school day as All Saints is now such a large school lots of pupils use the Bradley Road Footpaths to walk home. Also there is additional traffic at the end of the school day when parents arrive to collect their children and park in the cycle lane right the way down to number 347.

We felt that a compromise had been made when the neighbours agreed to the extension with conditions and with hindsight we now feel that we should have continued to object to a bungalow being developed into a much larger dwelling given the subsequent events. This matter is now affecting the well being of neighbours who are at their wits end and are fearful that this project is going to totally disrupt their lives as it will be them that have to live through the development whilst the applicant is resident elsewhere. So much so they are anticipating have to sell their home and move away which cannot be acceptable in this day and age that our older members of society are ignored.

The previous conditions / recommendations have not been met and nothing additional has been presented to comply with Policy LP24, therefore on what basis would the decision to decline this application change?

We do hope that you will take our comments and concerns into account before making your final judgment.

I would be grateful if you could acknowledge receipt of this email and confirm whether or not you are able to take this up on our behalf.