

Kirklees Council - Planning
Investment and Regeneration Service
PO Box B93, Civic Centre 3,
Off Market Street,
Huddersfield HD1 2JR
14 October 2020

Dear Mr Bearcroft,

Objection to Planning Application 2020/92400, 402 Birkby Road, Huddersfield

I note that the plans have changed yet again but the new ones do now show where the floor level of the garage is intended to be. The garage will still be well forward of the host property, about 1 metre above the level of the carriageway making the top of the garage about 3.8 metres above the road. Any building at that location will be highly visible from Birkby Road which is not in keeping with other properties in the local area. These measures do not address all of the issues identified by the Planning Inspector in supporting the Council's decision to reject last year's application for a detached garage. It might be a bit smaller and lower in height than the previous application and now has a flat roof, but unlike other buildings in the area, is not set back from the road and would still 'be seen as a large, prominent structure within the curtilage of a residential property'.

The earlier plans for this current application highlighted a hedge 3.2 metres tall which would conceal the garage. As I have previously pointed out a condition to grow such a hedge is not enforceable and therefore of no worth. The applicant is now suggesting a fence 2.6 metres high from a ground level about 1 metre above the carriageway. As I understand it, this is not part of the planning application so could only be put in place as a condition of this application. Such a condition for a fence extending 3.6 metres above the road level would not be acceptable at that location. It would be over two and a half times the maximum height for a fence adjacent to a highway without planning permission. There is a suggestion in the plan that the 2.6 metre high fence has been proposed by the Council Highways department as part of the road junction improvement scheme. As far as I can recall, this was not included in the public consultation so would require a separate planning application from the Highways Department. I continue to object to this application and believe that it would not be reasonable to approve it.