

Special Delivery

Kirklees Council
Planning
PO Box B93
Civic Centre 3
Huddersfield
HD1 2JR

- 6 MAR 2020

FAO Katie Wilson, Case Officer

4 March 2020

Dear Sirs

Application 2020/60/90367/E

**Outline application for part demolition of existing building
and erection of detached dwelling adjacent to 111 Marsh Lane, Shepley**

I live next door to 111 Marsh Lane and wish to object to the above application. My reasons for objecting are as follows:-

- The application involves the partial demolition of the existing outbuilding in the applicant's garden, which is attached to the outbuilding in my garden.
You will see that the outbuilding with the sloping roof and two white doors is in my garden, whereas the larger outbuilding (which I understand used to be a Tailor's workshop) is in the applicant's garden. The outline sketch plan proposal suggests that part of the applicant's outbuilding is to be utilised as a garage for 111 Marsh Lane and the remainder of the outbuilding is to be demolished. I am concerned at what effect this will have on my outbuilding, which is attached to the applicant's outbuilding. My husband regularly works from home
Any damage to our outbuildings which meant that he could not use them, or that they were no longer water tight, would therefore be a big problem for him. I am also concerned, particularly as he works from home, about the noise and disturbance of having a building yard virtually in our back garden.
- The new dwelling house will overlook my house and garden which will obviously cause a loss of privacy which I am concerned about. The applicant's existing outbuilding does of course overlook my property, but there is a world of difference between an unoccupied outbuilding, with no windows and a much bigger dwelling house. The design and access statement notes that the proposed plot for the new dwelling is 1152m² out of a total area of 1566m². That is nearly 74% which seems high to me. The design and access statement says that the size of the proposed new dwelling is reasonable, but that is more opinion than fact.
- Loss of my view and overshadowing of my house. The outline of the proposed new dwelling exceeds the outline of the applicant's existing outbuilding which is to be removed. I would be less concerned if the plans were amended so that the outline of the proposed new dwelling is the same, (so far as it encroaches on my view), as the existing outbuilding.

Continued...

- I note from the consultation response from KC Environmental Health, that the application needs to include an electrical vehicle charging point.

I understand that charging points may generate electromagnetic fields, which may be harmful. Any electrical vehicle charging point, therefore needs to be as far away from my property, garden and outbuilding as possible.

- I am not sure if the HM Land Registry current title plan for my property is accurate, but on studying it, it appears as if the development may be on land in our ownership. I have – you will see that there is a clear gap shown between the end of our outbuilding and the boundary with the applicant's garden. In reality there is no gap – the boundary is immediately adjacent to the end of our outbuilding.

I have spoken to a Planning Consultant who identified other concerns that I should raise with you as follows:-

- It appears as though the access for emergency services to the new dwelling house will be through the garden of 111 Marsh Lane. Surely this cannot be acceptable, as if there are visitors parked at 111 Marsh Lane, how can they guarantee the access is kept clear. Surely this is dangerous and a risk to life.
- There is no bin collection point for the proposed dwelling house. The Kirklees bin wagon will not be able to access the property and the "bin-drag" distances from the property to the main road exceed the requirements set out in the Kirklees guidance.
- Whilst the Council no longer has set figures for space about building, should the proposed development have windows on the north facing elevation, these would only be 16 metres from the rear windows of my house which would not be acceptable in terms of privacy or amenity.
- The proposal appears to cover most of the rear garden of 111 Marsh Lane with tarmac, leaving no amenity space. Whilst the current owner may be okay with this, surely this would be unacceptable for future occupiers.
- If the HM Land Registry title plan is accurate as regards the position of our boundary in relation to our outbuildings, then the applicant should have served notice on us and signed certificate B. As this is not the case, the application should be invalid.

I should be obliged if you would acknowledge receipt of this letter in due course.

Yours faithfully