

We strongly object as follows: -

This planning application appears to be a resubmission of the previous application (2022/62/93919/W, which was withdrawn we suspect because of all the objections and the prospect of it being rejected.

All the points put forward by the clients Architect (who do not appear to be listed as a business) in the latest submission as a counter argument to previous objections are not valid reasons in our opinion to allow this development to continue.

The Architect point out there are various house types on Bradley Road but fail to mention any of the properties that are still bungalows and also at the spot where this current bungalow lies that the new build is going to be over bearing on the adjacent properties and out of character where it sits.

345 Bradley Road has been quoted as an example of this type of development, yet this took months / years to get full approval and had many amendments in particular to reduce the height and foot print to a more appropriate size that fits more in keeping with the two adjacent bungalows ( see applications 2018/62/90937/W, 2019/62/91083/W, 2020/62/92431/W & 2021/62/925/W).

*Whereas 404 Bradley Road was rejected outright on one objection which was supported by an official (not sure who) see application 2020/62/93167/W which details reasons for rejection which are very similar to this application*

We are struggling to see what has changed with this application other than the applicant getting their architect to include some photos and remove the balconies, are we missing something? The plans are still show an out of proportion sized building.

Their architects point out other properties and out building on Bradley Road, but these are selective to support their narrative. What they don't point out is that none of them are as intrusive as this proposed build.

Their architects state the current property does not meet their clients' needs and is in a state of disrepair. So, these reasons for demolishing and rebuild begs the questions why did the applicant

- buy a small bungalow if it did not meet their needs
- have never resided in the current property
- have let it run down to be in a state of disrepair

Kirklees (and the whole country) has a housing shortage and this is not helping when there is an ageing population that are looking to downsize. If Kirklees / Government continue to approve these types of developments they are not providing an adequate duty of care to their older residents in ensuring that adequate accommodation is available for all members of their community.

The stress and distress these developments have on adjacent neighbours is being totally ignored. Causing sleepless nights and detriment to mental health. There is no consideration for existing residents who have bought their properties based on the surrounding houses and outlook and to be able to have a decent quality of life in their retirement.

Why do planning continue to be so inconsistent in what is approved and what is not approved? The reason “there are a mix of houses and others have previous been approved” is not a valid reason, if this is the case then it should be rejected as was number 404.

All our previous objections still stand. See last application and below.

1) It is in contravention of the Labour Council manifesto policy (2018 under Housing – Extra Care) which quotes

“We do not have homes that meet the needs of an ageing population, or for people with disabilities. We need to use all means at our disposal including land ownership or planning system to redress the balance”.

2) It is contrary to Policy LP24 (a) and (b) of the Kirklees Local Plan and Chapter 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework. For the following reasons: -

A. The scale, massing and position of the proposed dwelling within the application site would have a detrimental impact upon visual amenity. The proposal would appear incongruous due to its height and position of adjacent dwellings and overall width and appear overly dominant within the street scene along Bradley Road to the detriment of the character of the local area. To approve the application would be contrary to Policy LP24(a) of the Kirklees Local Plan, the aims and guidance of Chapter 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework, which sets out that development should not harm visual amenity and sections on context, identity and built form in the National Design Guide

B. The scale, massing and position of the proposed dwelling within the application site and proximity to the adjacent bungalow (no. 378 Bradley Road) would lead to a detrimental overbearing and overshadowing impact on the occupiers of no. 372 Bradley Road to the detriment of residential amenity. The proposal would therefore fail to accord with the requirements of Policy LP24 (a), (b) or (c) of the Kirklees Local Plan or Chapter 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

3) Scale of the size of this development, compared to what is there now. Demolition and rebuild with large windows, is out of character with existing properties, not only the size but the shape and style.

4) Impact on neighbours and the Bradley Road thoroughfare this scale of demolition and excavation is surely going to cause. It will be a disruption to neighbours, pedestrians and road users. Bradley road is now a very busy road, particularly at the start and end of the school day as All Saints is now such a large school lots of pupils use the Bradley Road Footpaths to walk home.

Yet another bungalow being removed. Kirklees have really not listened to local residents. We have an ageing population that are looking to downsize and yet planning continue to approve not only new housing developments with larger properties but are also decimating the existing housing stock of bungalows and smaller properties, allowing them to be developed into large scale properties.

5) We feel there is also an environmental issue allowing such large houses to be built, also a discrimination against young people, small families and an aging population, as there is a lack of smaller houses and bungalows.