

DCAdmin

From:
Sent: 05 October 2023 22:14
To: DCAdmin
Subject: 2023/92467

To whom it may concern,

Please find attached comments regarding proposed planning of the above reference number.

Regards

05 Sept 2023

Notice of proposed planning application at No. 18 New Avenue, HD50JD **Ref: 2023/92467**

My home is attached to number 18, and I have carefully reviewed the proposed development and Kirklees guidance. I am writing to strongly contest the proposed planning application for the following reasons:

The planning permission is exactly as was submitted in August 2023 and rejected without the first floor, the reasons and recommendations as reported in the refusal have not been acknowledged. (2023/91693)

Contradictory Statements about Trees and Hedges:

Although the proposal claims that no trees or hedges will be removed, the current plans indicate otherwise, showing the extension coming right up to the boundary of my home. I am under the impression that at least 1 metre should be left in this instance. According to my house deeds it clearly states I have boundary ownership with the relevant markings, the removal of the beech tree/hedge by my neighbour would require my permission.

Impact on Light and Privacy:

The existing conservatory on the rear of our home will be overshadowed losing light and changing the view by any further building works at number 18 if permitted up to the boundary of the property. The proposed building would be overbearing and will significantly diminish the amount of light affecting the liveability and enjoyment of these spaces, together with the increased noise level associated with such a huge social area.

Damage to Front Boundary Wall:

The removal of the front boundary wall by the property owners to allow parking access has destabilized my front boundary wall and left it in a poor condition with exposed and ragged brick edges. No efforts have been made to rectify this issue. Although this doesn't apply to planning permission it warrants a mention.

Inadequate Width for Side Extension:

According to legislation that mandates leaving a 1-meter gap from the boundary for side extensions the properties on New Avenue, particularly the front view (North East elevation), were built in the 1960s with extremely narrow driveways. The garages were positioned to the rear, away from the main building of the houses to allow for access. Incorporating a wide enough garage to accommodate a car with access granted around the property is not feasible. If there is no access, the only available route to the rear of this property would be through the main house, further resembling terraced houses.

Concerns about Current Parking Arrangements:

The proposed planning states that there will be no change to the current parking arrangements. However, there are currently five vehicles parked at the property all off the road, mounting the kerb regardless, which has not been dropped, with vehicles regularly overhanging the pavement. Moving the side entrance to the front would be unworkable as it would be obstructed by a vehicle. The proposed plans also do not indicate the provision for refuse bins, as there will be no space available at the front of the property due to the existing parked vehicles, and no access to be able to move them to the rear of the property.

Questionable Purpose of Further Planning:

Planning permission was granted around 10 years ago to convert the property from a one-bedroom bungalow into a four-bedroom home. Given that the proposed plans do not include additional bedrooms and a garage already exists, I question the purpose and necessity of further planning at this stage.

Unauthorized Works and Compliance:

I am concerned about the works that have already been undertaken inside the property, including the relocation of the staircase and removal of interior walls. It is unknown whether planning permission or building regulations have been obtained for these modifications. The necessary complaint form has been submitted to building control and I await the outcome.

Unauthorized Outdoor Garden Room and Fire Hazards:

A large outdoor garden room was erected during lockdown without planning permission, and although retrospective planning permission has since been granted, it does not conform to the submitted and approved plans. Additionally, a large metal 'L'-shaped canopy has been added, housing a restaurant-sized pizza oven, large barbecue and kitchen area, and a dining space. The presence of fire hazards is a significant concern.

Overdevelopment and Reduction of Garden Area:

Permitting the proposed development would leave the property with less than 50% of its original garden area, which was over 50 feet in length and approximately 20 feet wide. There would be no green space whatsoever left. This surely represents an excessive level of overdevelopment.

Inconsistency with Avenue's Architectural Style:

Granting permission for the development would result in the house no longer aligning with the architectural style of the other bungalows on the avenue. The proposed changes would transform the property from a semi-detached home to a configuration resembling a terraced house, overlooking the neighboring property at number 20 and the removal of the mature beech hedging which the proposal states will not be removed.

I hope that I have included enough information for someone to address the serious concerns we have regarding the safety of our own property, and would ask that someone inspect the work that has already been done and consider the monster extension to what was a 1 bedroom bungalow. I would appreciate further guidance regarding these concerns if planning are unable to allay my fears.