About the application

Application number: 2022/90745	
What is the application for?:	Erection of garden room gym/store
Address of the site or building:	27, Whitebeam Park, Birkby, Huddersfield, HD2 2GZ
Postcode:	HD2 2GZ

User comments

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

I write to object to the above planning application for the following reasons:

1. Design – The proposed outhouse is not of a design that is in keeping with the scale, character, or appearance of the area.

Character: It is the first building with a flat roof in this area; It is the first building with THREE doors on one side of the building in this area; It is the first building in this distance with a boundary (0cm). (See Fig 1)
Scale: Overhigh (3m) and oversize (62 m2);
Appearance: Building blocks in two colours (white and grey) are used on walls (Fig 1 & Fig 2)

2. Loss of Privacy –The proposed outhouse has an overlook issue; Breach of GDPR (General Data Protection Regulation);

Overlook three windows and three doors approximately 10 metres from most of my windows. This would lead to a significant reduction in privacy at my property. (see Fig 3, 4 and Fig 6).
GDPR
CCTV: CCTV installed on this outhouse pointed to my house. (see Fig 5)
Flooding Light: The sensor of the light has been used to collect data from my garden. (see Fig 5) (Donna Wood-Brignall from Kirklees Council visited my garden on 12 Oct 2021 and can confirm this issue)

3. Loss of light

This is the 2nd application; in the previous approval application, i.e. 2020/62/92572/W, it already makes the loss of light. It will increase the loss of light (see fig 7).

4. light pollution

There is much light installed on this outhouse, and all are turned on between 7 pm – 7 am. (See fig 8)

5. Misleading Drawing

It is a completed project, and the drawing of the application is misleading.
Lack of Max height of outhouse (see fig 9);
Lack the distance from three boundaries (see fig 10).
The description of the wall of the outhouse is wrong (see fig 11).

I, therefore, consider that the proposal is contrary to policies A, B, and C of the local plan and request that the planning application is refused.
(Fig can be found in the email to dc.admin)