

From:
To: [DCAdmin](#)
Subject: Comments about Planning Permission Application number 2021/62/90172/W
Date: 28 February 2021 16:13:19

6-8 Olney Street

Slaithwaite

Huddersfield

HD7 5EG

01484 472877

Comments about Planning Permission Application number 2021/62/90172/W

Erection of a two storey extension to side of 11 Olney Street, Slaithwaite, Huddersfield, HD7 5EG

The roof covering of the proposed structure is described in the application as concrete Marley modern tiles to match the existing.

However, the slates on the existing structure are riven / cleaved Penrhyn Heather Blue from a northern Welsh slate mine such as Cwt-y-Bugail. The only way to match the existing would be to use Penrhyn Heather Blues of the same size & gauge. Concrete tiles are much cheaper than natural slate. Matching the existing roof and indeed that of the adjacent buildings is being ignored probably due to the cost of doing it correctly.

The rear of the structure shows a Juliet balcony. This is hardly in keeping with the existing building of Edwardian style. These balconies serve no purpose or benefit over an opening window. The balcony would be better replaced with an opening window of similar style to the existing building, in a 2:1 ratio, of the same size with a sash style frame and so the lintels and cills line through.

The bedroom windows would also overlook the house at the rear, which I'm sure they wouldn't be too keen on.

The proposed extension lines up with the existing original front wall of the house and is to be made from coursed natural york stone to match the existing. However, the gutter line, corbels, eaves, and ridge stop lower than that of the existing structure. It also means the window cills and lintels do not line through with the existing. It makes the windows look too small and out of character. The extension looks like it is stuck on to the end of the existing structure and done on the cheap, so as not to have to line up all the building elements. Why not do it right? It might cost slightly more, but it would look much better and in keeping with the existing structure.

The extension would look much better if the ridge and eaves, front and rear walls, all lined up with the existing building. The springer stones and tabling stones moved to the end of the building, and walling stone, gutter and corbels all lined thorough to match. The windows should also match the existing structure in size and alignment. The extension would then look like it was always part of the Edwardian structure. The current proposal makes it look like a bodged attempt at matching the style.

Why have a rear external staircase? It will look like an eyesore stuck to the back of the extension. Use the existing internal one or form a new internal one with the rear of the extension lining up with the rear of the existing building.

Looking at the garage arrangement, the internal width is shown as 4500mm. This is hardly the width required for a double garage. The average car is 1.8m wide and 2.0m to the wing mirrors. If the two cars are parked side by side, it only leaves 300mm between them and 300mm to the garage walls. You would hardly be able to open the car doors, let alone get in or out. Getting out of the car via the sun roof or boot would be an easier option. Perhaps the garage design is actually just for storage or a workshop and not for vehicles? So the problem of parking on the street will continue.

The door leading from the garage into the playroom would only be able to open by 300mm when a car was parked there. Hardly easy access.

A small double garage door width in the UK is 4250mm. The proposal is shown as 3475mm. It would be impossible to move two cars through the door at the same time. Each car would have to manoeuvre into the garage at a 30 degree angle to pass through the opening whilst avoiding the other car. Blocking the road whilst attempting this strange manoeuvre.

The extension is 750 to 1000mm too narrow to make a practical double garage.

When manoeuvring out of the garage, there will be terribly restricted viewing access of the pavement and road to the left due to the existing ground level extension structure. A dog or pedestrian could be easily knocked over as a car pulled out of the garage across the pavement before they were even seen, even when driving out in a forward direction. Some incompetent drivers would drive forward into the garage, which would mean reversing out of the garage across the pavement and into the road. This would be even more dangerous to pedestrians and road users with the terrible visibility. The rear of the car would have passed over the pavement and be half way across the first lane before the driver was able to see what road users and pedestrians were there.

Overall the design needs a major review and redesign before I would consider it acceptable. Unless of course, the planners or the Architect aren't as picky of this egregious design? It could be so much better with more thought.