

From:
To: [DCAdmin](#)
Cc:
Subject: Application Number 2019/91083. 345 Bradley Road, Bradley, Huddersfield, HD2 1PR, Demolition of Existing Dwelling and Erection of Detached Dwelling with Detached Garage/Store.
Date: 12 March 2020 10:47:14

Dear Sirs,

I along with my wife and other neighbours attended the Planning Sub Committee meeting on 17th December 2019 when the plans for this proposal were discussed and unfortunately deferred because of an error on one of the plans submitted. Unfortunately I will be unable to attend the Planning Sub Committee meeting on 19th March 2020 due to a previous engagement. Therefore I would appreciate the Planning Department and all Councillors involved to consider the following objections.

Whilst we appreciate that the applicant has addressed most of our concerns in that the proposed building has been lowered in height and length and there is no balcony, we still consider that this is an overdevelopment as it exceeds the footprint of the existing bungalow. It also represents a 2 story house between two smaller bungalows. Both the proposed house and the proposed garage are twice the size of the existing buildings and therefore we cannot understand what has changed to make the Planning Department change their decision from 'refused' to 'support'. Perhaps this decision could be explained.

There is already a shortage of smaller properties for an ever increasing ageing population to downsize to, and successive governments have tried to address this situation. It would appear that a developer with his own construction company has seen what happened at 341 Bradley Road and decided he could do the same at 345.

In one of the supporting documents for 345 it is stated that "341 being built higher than approved sets a precedent". I fully agree with that comment, BUT the only precedent that it sets is that it should never happen again. If we are all allowed to ignore plans, what is the point of having a Planning Department in the first place?

Bradley Road is 2,838 metres or 1.763 miles long with numerous houses, but the ONLY property to be demolished is number 341. Now we have the proposal to demolish a second bungalow at 345, and we are in the middle of both developments - posing the question "how unlucky are we"?

At first plans were submitted 2 years ago for erection of extensions and alterations at this property and after amendments these were subsequently passed with conditions that there would be no further development at the property and the existing garage remained. Now it would appear that Planning are supporting these latest plans and therefore totally ignoring the conditions of the plans approved on 16th July 2018. The question is why?

The extent and height of the glazing on the back of our neighbour's proposed house would be increased significantly. This would add to the overall intrusiveness of the development and result in a direct loss of privacy due to the distances involved. Furthermore, the fact that our neighbour's house is on higher ground than ours is an important factor in any assessment. We feel that privacy not only relates to overlooking but also the relationship between areas of private amenity space in terms of noise and activity and in particular to our much valued garden. With the proposed large garage/store being situated much further down the garden than present and presumably an extended drive to it, we are concerned that vehicles travelling down such a long drive will cause additional noise and inconvenience.

We are also concerned that this development will be a major disruption to our lives in that we will be living next to a building site whilst the applicant and his family are residing elsewhere. Having lived through the demolition of the bungalow at 341 Bradley Road we know only too well what this means in terms of noise, stress, quality of life, inconvenience by way of vehicles blocking our exit and the fact that we had to have our house repainted as a result of the dust and debris.

If Planning do change their decision and allow this development to go ahead, what assurances will be given that the applicant will not breach the plans? What thresholds are given to applicants - as 341 Bradley Road went a metre higher and although the Planning department were made aware of this the applicants were not made to reduce this. The development at 341 turned out to be a total nightmare for us and was not monitored by any official from Building/Planning.

Until recently we have been misled by the Location Plan on the Grouped Plans & Elevations (ID797648) which showed a much smaller build and therefore did not impact on our property. However when we looked at the garage plan we could see just how big the whole proposal was. Therefore I ask all Councillors involved to ignore this Location Plan as it obviously gives a false impression. I have just received a message from Planning which states that all Members will be notified of this error at the Meeting, BUT I URGE ALL MEMBERS TO LOOK AT THIS IN ADVANCE OF THE MEETING.

If these plans are approved, in view of the fact that this has been 2 years during which 7 plans have been submitted, we would request that the following conditions are agreed to in writing in advance of building commencement:-

1. A metal barrier/fence should be erected adjacent to our sun lounge which is virtually on the construction site. This to prevent any potential damage to our property when demolition and construction take place.
2. Prior notice should be given of any potential damage to our cars and property from dust/debris.
3. No unsocial working hours ie. Sundays or evenings as some neighbours work and these are their quiet times.
4. No blocking of drives with construction vehicles or parking on grass verges, particularly adjacent to the refuge as this would interfere with traffic on Bradley Road.
5. When demolishing the existing garage which is directly on the boundary, to respect the fact that we have an ornamental garden on the other side. Furthermore to erect a fence of similar height immediately the garage is demolished in order to protect our privacy.
6. When the construction of the proposed garage/store is commenced we respectfully request that as our fence and some trees are very close to this development that these are not disturbed by the excavation/foundations.

All we request if these plans are passed is to be shown some consideration during the demolition and rebuild as after all it will affect our

lives more than most.

Perhaps the applicant could advise whether the fence which has been partly erected adjacent to our wall at the side of our property is a permanent structure, because it is not feather edge fencing as described in the original application.

We ask you to kindly consider these issues, and if the plans are passed that the above conditions are incorporated in the decision.

P.S. please print the content in full as the applicant will know it's origin, and to leave parts out will lose the meaning.