**About the application**

| Application number: 2022/62/90191/W | |
|---|---|
| What is the application for?: | Extension and alterations to existing garage / office building to create dwellin |
| Address of the site or building: | 410, Birkby Road, Birkby, Huddersfield, HD2 2DN |
| Postcode: | HD2 2DN |

**User comments**

| Type of comment: An objection | |
|---|---|
| Do you wish your comments to be published on the website anonymously? | Yes |

We wish to lodge our objection to this application as neighbouring residents. The application was submitted only 4 months after the approval of application 2021/91239 on the same site, an approval to demolish two large houses and build two even larger ones. We do not believe this application should be considered in isolation from the development now underway as it should have been included in the original application to make clear the intention for the whole site.

Regarding the application form we would like to make several points:

• regarding trees and hedges (10) - this has been marked as 'no' but this is inaccurate - the extension to the garage falls within a red hatched area, as described in application 2013/93405 where no buildings or extensions can be erected. Already one protected tree has been felled.
• biodiversity (12) - again this has been marked 'no' but at the northern boundary of the site there is a designated 'Wildlife Habitat Network'.
• There is no provision for waste or storage for recycling as required (14)
• The application clearly states that this is for one new dwelling unit (16)

We also have several comments on the Design and Access Statement:

• 2.02 - the Site Planning History fails to mention that the original garage was built higher than the original planning approval and retrospective planning was then applied for 2013/93405

• 3.03 - the fact that the parents babysit for the applicant's children
is irrelevant. Many grandparents babysit their grandchildren without the need to build an additional dwelling. There is ample space is both very large adjoining houses to accommodate this.

• 3.05 - Impact on Neighbouring Properties. The claim that this development 'will have no impact on neighbouring properties' is clearly inaccurate. There is a direct sightline between the garage and No. 7 Valley Head. There is real concern that the outside

between the garage and No. 7 Valley Head. There is real concern that the outside lighting will cause a lot of light pollution  Additionally  how this can be claimed when neither the architect, tree officers nor planning officers have visited the properties in Valley Head to see for themselves. We would have thought this particularly important considering the topography of the site.

• 4.03 - Environmental factors - Provision for a car charging point is curious when it is claimed that neither parent drives. We consider this an attempt to claim environmental credentials when the evidence of the development so far is that scant regard has been paid to such matters  Indeed  the tree protection measures from the previous consent have been completely disregarded. Fences were put in place on the north side of the development long after the demolition and major earth movement began, and subsequently moved around as convenient. Planning enforcement and the tree officer have visited this site and agreed this was the case (although  unlike us  they considered it 'trivial').

• 6.01 - The applicant claims that they are happy that the annex remaining within their ownership be conditioned as part of the approval  Prior conditions imposed on this site have been set aside very recently by planning officers (e.g. the condition that 410 should only ever be a bungalow and have no windows on the eastern elevation) Why would this new condition hold any more weight? In addition, the current owners and contractors have not adhered to the conditions attached to 2021/91239 (see 4 03 above).

• 7.02 - How can this development be 'evidently subservient to' and at the same time need extending in order to 'better relate in scale' to 412 and 410  This is clearly a proposal for a separate dwelling, not ancillary accommodation, when it is completely separate from the main household and the opposite side of the main driveway. There could well be future pressure to subdivide the ownership.

To conclude, we believe that this application represents complete overdevelopment of the site. The proposed dwelling will be a medium size house, with 3 reception rooms and 2 bedrooms. It will have more floor space than other bungalows in the adjacent lane  What was a lovely woodland acreage with two residential dwelling in sympathy with the woodland habitat, has already been destroyed by the construction of a 5m high wall, visible from right across the valley, which blights the property at 9 Valley Head which sits beneath it. The tree protection plan has not been adhered to and there has been real compaction of the ground around the trees on the northern side of the site. Approval of this third dwelling will only add to the urbanisation of the plot and for this, and all the reasons cited above, we urge you to refuse this application.