

Comments to changes to Planning Application 2021/62/91239/W - 410/412 Birkby Road

Dear Mr Bearcroft

After due consideration and review of the newly submitted plans for the above property please find our comments below. We would appreciate if you and the committee would take these comments into consideration when deliberating on this matter.

- We note that the side elevation of No 410 has had one large window removed which is a positive move, however that still leaves another two large windows downstairs and the bathroom windows. Bathroom windows we do not object to but the Large windows down stairs still overlook our property and are invasive on our right to privacy.
 - The photo that we submitted previously (Neighbour representations [id 875729]) shows the view we have from our bedroom window. This is taken from inside the building.
 - Document 'General [id 879447] Size: 281KB 17/06/2021 - ADDITIONAL INFO House Angles 410 & 412', in the additional comments section, is once again full of incorrect statements and should be removed and not considered. You can see from the images below which have been produced from professional, measurable photos that the distances have been well overstated. It is 22 meters from No 7 Valley Head, not 29 Meters as stated for the black dotted line submitted, 24 Meters from No 9 Valley Head, not 28 Meters as stated.

From 7 Valley Head



From 9 Valley Head



- The field of view's that are stated in the document assume that we all have tunnel vision or can't turn our heads. The image below shows the realistic field of view from No 7 Valley Head, Kitchen, Bedroom and Laundry windows. I haven't bothered doing the same for No 9 Valley Head as the hexagon shape at the top of No 9 is a dining area which has a 180 degree view and therefore looks straight up at the proposed development.



- We note also that the views submitted are old, it shows images of trees that have now been removed and elements of the properties that have been changed 2 to 3 years ago. The images submitted were taken with a Drone which may be considered illegal today. The images were taken in summer when the foliage covers the proposed areas. These trees lose all of their leaves in autumn and winter and this is when we will lose our privacy the most.
- The newly submitted documents show photographs of hedges which it says will be kept to retain privacy. The Arboreal report states that they have been maintained, they have not! We have previously asked the previous occupier to trim back some of these hedges, as we said in our previous documents to you, but they have still not been trimmed. The new owners should not rely on these as something that will protect their privacy. Should these hedges not be trimmed we will be asking Kirklees council to step in as per the law governing the heights of hedges between properties.
- The illustrations of existing properties were all contentious developments at the time to both existing residents and for some the council themselves. You will notice from the aerial photographs that most of the houses, and even the nearest bungalows are built to a similar style. The individual properties mentioned are mostly on the other, south eastern side of Birkby Road towards Inglewood Avenue, not on the North Western side as these properties will be. Developing in this way changes the landscape and the cohesive community spirit of the area in a detrimental way, isolating the inhabitants from each other.

- We are not sure why there are examples of various types of Gabion baskets as we can still see the existing ones used to underpin the existing No 410. Which have not been 'landscaped' to hide.
- Moving the property away from the 'Red' Tree zone back onto the original 410 ground space is a positive move however the distance is so little the new two storey building will still be overlooking, overbearing and an infringement on our right to privacy.
- There has been no attempt to resolve the issue of the turning space for emergency vehicles, it would appear to have made it worse by cramming the two buildings into a smaller space.

We still object to the proposals made and where appropriate our previous comments and objections will still apply.