

Kirklees Council Planning & Development Service
PO Box B93, Civic Centre 3, Off Market Street, Huddersfield, HD1 2JR

Your reference: 2022/92711 and 121, Slaithwaite Road, Meltham, Holmfirth, HD9 5PW.

I would make the following observations and comments about the above Planning Application.

- 1) This clearly is a retrospective application as no doubt you will be aware from a view of the work that has already been completed to the rear and front of the property; both elevations have work that does not conform to the plan numbered 2021/94239, as approved.
I am not certain what extent of deviation from plan is allowed but it would appear, that either construction has been done on the hoof or following plans that have not been presented for proper consideration. Are you yourselves concerned at the scale or type of building work that has occurred without the requisite notice?
- 2) I am concerned at the increase in the height of the eaves relative to the original building at the address. The wall heights were to be increased by a metre from those existing before the proposed development. The wall height appears to have been increased further now, though by how much, is not annotated on the latest elevation plan (as it was on 2021/94239). I would wish to know please what the increase in proposed wall height is, when compared to the original? I have a real concern that the new wall height
will be great and that the increase in height over the
existing building will be unreasonable.
- 3) In comment too about that additional height of the walls, the roof pitch then has had to be lowered to what seems me, to be too low a slope. I begin to wonder if the roof is going to look more like that of a factory roof than that of a dwelling.
- 4) I refer here to the proposal to remove the garage structure and replace it with a double height hallway. I am not sure what effect the proposal will have on the aesthetic of the front of the property – it looks more than a little “clunky” to me from the elevation drawing – and I am concerned at the proposal for that reason. And so, to that end, I would still welcome a 3D view of the proposed elevations of the building. I note that one was provided with the first planning application 2021/93100 but not with the second nor with this third application.
- 5) I note the newly proposed (though now actual) increase in the depth of the windows on the first-floor rear elevation to the structure. As welcome as I am sure they are intended to be for an enhanced view of West Nab, I believe that both the proximity and elevation of No 121 relative to my house and garden will mean that the larger windows are now intrusive to my privacy.
- 6) I had previously stated that I would be guided and indeed re-assured by the planning professionals’ expertise in determining whether the scale of the change to the existing property is appropriate for its location, setting and in keeping with surrounding properties. The proposed changes to the front elevation, in my view, add to my previously expressed concerns about the extent (size and shape) of the intended development as now proposed; that within the narrow and adjacent position to this address the amended, overall design of the intended structure will have a detrimental effect on the value of my property as well as others in the immediate area.