

From:
To: [DCAdmin](#)
Subject: 47 Lower Lane, Little Gomersal. 2021/62/93017/E Objection
Date: 03 October 2021 19:36:32

Hello,

I sent this previously on the 30th Sept, please could you not publish my name and address on the document that goes on the website. I know the applicant will know my details but I don't want them published.

Thank you,

2021/62/93017/E

This is my objection to plans for house modifications and a detached garage at 47 Lower Lane, Little Gomersal, BD19 4HY.

I am a direct neighbour to this property; the quality of my family's life will be directly affected if this application was to be approved. I do not believe that anything in this application sits well in the Little Gomersal Conservation Area. My house and garden will lose all privacy from being overlooked from new dormers in the raised roof and from the extension's bank of glass windows facing and looking over my boundary wall, which is less than a metre away.

Attempts to discuss this with the applicants were unsuccessful.

<!--[if !supportLists]-->1) <!--[endif]-->This is a CONSERVATION AREA. The house sits within the Little Gomersal Conservation Area, this is a protected area; there are restrictions on what can and can't be built there for reasons of protecting the aesthetics and beauty of the locality. I feel the proposed plans detract from anything that should be approved in a conservation area such as this. A full width flat roofed dormer to the rear (actually the side/north facing side of the house when viewed from the road) and further dormers to the front(south side) suits nothing and is not in-keeping with the Conservation Area. The original cottage, dating from at least 1907 (from an OS map of this age) has already been extended and modified at least once.

<!--[if !supportLists]-->2) <!--[endif]-->PREVIOUS APPLICATIONS. There have been numerous persistent previous applications to modernise and enlarge this cottage which once had a much larger garden.

Nov 2003- 2003/94556 Erection of Extensions within a Conservation Area. Refused.

Oct 2001- 2001/93299 Erection of Extensions and Alterations. Approved.

19th Feb 2001- 2001/90454 Demolition of Bungalow. Refused

8th Feb 2001- 2001/90355 Demolition of existing dwelling and plans for 2 houses. Refused.

It seems that if further plans to modify the Cottage are approved there will be little left

to identify the original, protected, historic building.

<!--[if !supportLists]-->3) <!--[endif]-->GARDEN PREVIOUSLY DEVELOPED. In 2006 there was a bungalow built (45 Lower Lane 2006/90175) in the garden of 47 Lower Lane. This new Bungalow was not built in the Conservation Area. However, it did have to adhere to very strict guidelines and restrictions because of its close influence on the Conservation Area. The same restrictions must apply to this house, which actually is in the Conservation Area.

<!--[if !supportLists]-->4) <!--[endif]-->OVER DEVELOPED SITE. I feel that when the original garden was split to provide land for the bungalow too much land went to the new bungalow, leaving the Cottage with a smaller garden with little space for development. Plans for a detached garage leaves little or no outside amenity space once several vehicles are on site- especially allowing space for the current electronic gates to open inwards. **According to BE5 4.17 of the Kirklees Unitary Development Plan, 'Spaces between building are as important as the buildings themselves in the built environment. New development in Conservation areas must be considered not only on the basis of how it affects the setting of existing buildings, but how it affects their overall density and consequently whether the character of the area will be adversely affected.'** I believe the proposed garage to be too close to the neighbouring house (45). The land to the north/side of the cottage, where the extension is proposed, was once an entrance road to the field behind, the planned extension and bank of windows would be less than a metre from, and facing, my boundary wall and garden; this is too close and uncomfortably slightly voyeuristic. Allowing this new development would leave the site completely overdeveloped.

<!--[if !supportLists]-->5) <!--[endif]-->TREES. To the question **"Are there any trees or hedges on your own property or on adjoining properties which are within falling distance of your proposed development?"** The Applicant answered "No". This is far from the truth. There are THREE very mature and tall sycamore trees which if fell would fall right over the entire Cottage. These can easily be seen on Google Earth. These are protected trees. **"These trees are an integral part of a linear group of trees which stretches the full length of Lower Lane. These trees are a prominent landscape feature in the locality and contribute to the character of the Conservation Area. As such they contribute significantly to public amenity."** (2021/92928 Tree Work Application to trees in Gomersal House Grounds on Lower Lane. These were Kirklees Planning's comments when the application to remove a protected tree was refused). The extremely close proximity (less than 6m) of the new extension to the two huge trees in my garden means that the new build would be directly on top of the root mass of both trees. I know this from speaking with a retired Forestry Manager from a very large private estate in Scotland. Whilst the applicant intends to build directly onto his patio, I'm sure foundations would actually be required. These deep damaging foundations would have an adverse effect on the health and stability of the trees, particularly since the road, Lower Lane, limits the reach of the tree's roots to the East. Changes to the land use and water drainage that close to the trees could alter the immediate water table, again causing harm to the trees. I am more worried and concerned about this more than anything else on this objection letter, not forgetting the fact that damage caused to the trees in my garden would have to be rectified at my expense. If one tree has to be removed it could also cause damage to others due to differing wind patterns, shelter provided to other trees would be lost making them more susceptible to storm damage.

<!--[if !supportLists]-->6) <!--[endif]-->BUNGALOW PROTECTION. It is widely known (especially in the Kirklees District) that there is a shortage of bungalows and cottages suitable for elderly or disabled people and small families. Few bungalows, if any, are being built now and many are being demolished or enlarged, such as the proposals for this cottage. This quaint stone cottage needs protecting, as do the other two bungalows behind it, 156 and 154 Gomersal Lane, although, sadly, 154 has plans submitted to demolish it which are currently pending Kirklees' decision. 2021/62/90299. The Government is currently discussing a Bill to protect Bungalows, which may be too late to protect this one. Also, it is falsely perceived that by making your house bigger helps solve the current housing problem, it doesn't. Another house is not being created; a

much needed bungalow is being removed forever.

<!--[if !supportLists]-->7) <!--[endif]-->PRIVACY and OVERLOOKING. The proposed designs greatly impact on my privacy and how my family would be able to use our private garden. The dining room extension has large windows/glass doors on all 3 sides, one side is less than a meter away from our low wall (dating 1847) and the view from this side window is entirely my garden. The glass doorway would also assume that the view of my garden (with my family in it) is their view.

Should the proposed dormer rooves be granted permission then we face the loss of privacy over our complete garden AND our windows of our house would no longer be private. The cottage is at an angle to our house, whilst this is a low angle it greatly opens up and accentuates the view of our garden from the north side dormer. The plans mention that the dormers are to the front and rear of the property, they are in fact on either side of it when you assume that the front of the house faces the road. Dormer windows are normally on the front or rear of a house and overlooking the garden belonging to the property, not to the sides overlooking neighbours' gardens as these plans do. Two of the three northern windows are to be frosted glass, but these glazing units could be changed to clear glass in the future should the house be reconfigured internally, as can be done without permissions. Also, windows open. Opening the windows on a hot day will allow a panoramic view, uninterrupted, of our complete garden and my family in it; and also into our windows.

<!--[if !supportLists]-->8) <!--[endif]-->FLAT ROOF in a conservation area? I have looked on Google Earth and searched the entire Little Gomersal Conservation Area and cannot find one single property with a dormer style roof, whether built at the time of the buildings original construction, or at a later date. Not one, in the entire Area; that's not one pitched dormer roof extension never mind a full width Dormer with a FLAT ROOF. Referring to **Kirklees' Unitary Development Plan** directly:

4.33 Dormer extensions can be very prominent features, being situated high above street level.

The size of front dormers should be limited, to avoid detrimental effects to the roofscape of residential areas. In exceptional circumstances good design may indicate a departure from the policy.

BE15 DORMER EXTENSIONS TO THE FRONT OR MAIN ELEVATIONS OF DWELLINGS WILL NORMALLY BE PERMITTED PROVIDED THAT:

- i THE ORIGINAL ROOF FORM AND COVERING REMAINS THE PREDOMINANT FEATURE;**
- ii THE EXTENSION DOES NOT EXCEED MORE THAN 50% OF THE WIDTH OF THE ORIGINAL ROOF, AND IS CENTRALLY PLACED;**
- iii WHEN MEASURED IN THE VERTICAL PLANE A DISTANCE OF 1.0M APPROXIMATELY IS ACHIEVED BETWEEN THE GUTTER LINE OF THE DWELLING AND THE BASE OF THE FRONT WALL OF THE DORMER AND 0.5M APPROXIMATELY IS ACHIEVED BETWEEN THE RIDGE OF THE DWELLING AND THE JUNCTION OF THE DORMER**

Based on the proposed design, the north facing Dormer is a Main Elevation (as it is viewed from the road) and this meets NONE of these criteria. These are criteria which Kirklees use to approve any application.

-Stone slates will NOT remain the predominant feature.

-The dormer exceeds more than 50% of the width of the house, it is nearer 100%.

-It is NOT centrally placed from the outside end walls of the house.

-There is not enough space for 1.0m of vertical plane between the gutter line and the front wall of the dormer, nor does the 0.5m measurement appear to work.

Clearly allowing this North facing dormer and allowing the removal of the majority of a beautiful stone slate roof would be **'detrimental to the roofscape of a residential area'** in particular a Conservation Area roofscape. Could we also be ensured that the materials used on the sides of the dormers are stone and not timber, which would likely be replaced with uPVC strips at some stage? The plans are unclear.

I do not want to comment on the South facing dormers as they are overlooking the house and garden of 45 Lower Lane and those neighbours can comment should they wish to.

<!--[if !supportLists]-->9) <!--[endif]-->NEW ROOF HEIGHT. I have studied the plans and various photos, I have been searching for details and precise measurements on the proposal that indicate how much the roof height is being raised by. I can see there are designs to lower the floor levels which might slightly reduce the height required, but there is such a very shallow pitch on the original dwelling roof which must mean the new roof pitch must be a lot higher than the original to accommodate the rooms. I think it needs to be made clear exactly how much higher the new roof is going to be. I don't think we are looking at the full picture of the final height. Can we have exact measurements and plans that can be adhered to should these plans be approved?

I note that plans submitted in 2003 (2003/94556) were refused, it was a similar design only slightly larger, and this greatly increased the roof height. It was refused for the following reasons, which mostly can apply to the new 2021 planning submission:-

(1) The increased height, expanse and angle of roof, removal of chimneys, profile of dormer windows and relation of the roof and extension to the parent dwelling, would dominate and detract from the character and appearance of the parent building and its modest place in the Little Gomersal Conservation Area setting. The proposals are thus contrary to Policies D2, BE5, BE13 and BE14 of the Kirklees Unitary Development Plan.

<!--[if !supportLists]-->10) <!--[endif]-->Should the plans be approved, I would like to know and be assured that any stone used to make modifications to the original building and the extension will be reclaimed stone of the same style and aged as the original walls. In particular the sides that are going to be facing my property and garden. After all, we are talking about a Conservation Area aren't we?

Thank you for reading my Objections and I hope that Kirklees take them into consideration when making this important decision.