

From:

Sent: Saturday, February 10, 2024 2:23 PM

To: Molly Storer

Subject: RE: (2023/93649) 25, Greenlaws Close, Upperthong, Holmfirth, HD9 3HN

CAUTION: External email. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Afternoon Molly,

I hope this email finds you well.

Apologies in advance for the length of this email. Please do read through it all as it is important and very relevant to this application and the revisions attached. These address, where necessary, what I believed to be previous shortcomings and also address material planning considerations that were within the submitted objections.

Please find attached amended plans (proposed floor plans and elevations along with a proposed block plan) for the project.

In summary these include the following amends;

- Proposed extension reduced further in height (by lowering the proposed extension floor levels) This results in a larger step down to clearly show a good degree of subservience. The proposed front roof slope is 575mm below existing, rear one 200mm below existing and an overall lower proposed roof apex set 450mm below the existing main roof apex.
- The internal layout has altered slightly, to more suit the applicants young (and growing) family. This I don't think you will be too concerned about from a planning perspective but significantly the utility rear door and access directly into/through the garage ensures access to the rear of the property, in line this creates a well-balanced proposed extension in accordance with the KMC SPD (4.2 The original House Key design principle 2 Impact on the original house).
- The property still remains a three bedroomed property yet creates a small study at first floor level which will provide much needed office space for home working (a common theme following the outfall of Covid-19).
- Significantly the Technical housing standards – nationally described space standard states a single bedroom should measure at least 7.5m². The proposed first floor study measures 2.35m x 2.35m (and that is with the existing outer leaf of stone removed) this equates to 5.52m², a clear shortfall on the required standard and therefore should not be considered as a 4th bedroom.
- A high level window has been added to the garage. This will reduce the over reliance on artificial lighting. It will help reduce the properties carbon footprint and also positively feed into local and national planning policy on climate change. The space separation, mature evergreen boundary treatment and fact that this garage/store is not habitable accommodation should, I contend, be acceptable on privacy issues/considerations.
- A rear door has been added to the proposed utility along with steps to merge the differing floor levels of the proposed garage and dwelling. This will provide easy, safe and secure access to the rear of the property to the transportation of household rubbish, garden waste, tools, etc. My client wishes for the rear garden area to be secure for
 Whilst the KMC SPD states *“Two-storey and first floor side extensions should: retain a gap of at least 1 metre to boundary walls to avoid a terracing effect and to retain rear access to gardens.”* We contend this amended design provides easy access to gardens and does not form a terracing effect given the space separation and remoteness of the neighbours garage. The remaining drive to the side of the proposed extension does not belong to the applicant BUT its highly unlikely that this will/could be developed/built on which would for a terracing appearance. This proposal does not impact on the development opportunity of the neighbouring property. It seems clear to me that this policy is more intended for when properties are all in a straight(er) line and to prevent the infilling of gaps. The layout of this particular subject property prevents this. Hopefully this can be accepted as good justification and to suit my clients preference and desire to create a secure and safe rear garden.
- Bin storage area. The previous plans didn't appear to consider this aspect. Whilst the client currently keeps their bins in front of the existing garage they intend to still keep them on their own land. Their preference is to keep them to the front of the lounge (between the house and existing/retained parking space) but could also keep them to the front of the proposed garage/store as there is sufficient room to park a vehicle in front (as demonstrated via photos of the proposed plans) along with a 2 x bins (green and grey). Whilst I note that the KMC SPD has a key design policy in relation to vegetation and tree planting it is already my clients intention to remove the planter from the front of the property in any case. This, alone, does not require planning consent so in my opinion should not be considered as detrimental to the overall scheme.

As all applications are considered on their own merit this particular application should be no different. The property is effectively an end terrace property (1 of 4) given the previous, and very similar, extension to the adjoining property (No 27). Formerly this appears to have been a semi-detached/Link Semi-detached property **BUT** the two storey side extension to the adjoining property (No. 27) effectively joins onto the single storey side garage of No 29. Its important to also note the other end of the terrace, No 31 also has a two storey side extension.

The topography slopes from North to South as do roof levels and floor levels of each property, significantly the roof level of the adjoining properties two storey side extension is at the same level of the main house roof.

In assessing the proposals specifically against the Kirklees Planning Supplementary document '[Extensions and alterations](#)' Section 5.19 – 5.23 I comment as follows;

This seems to focus on ensuring “*Adequate space between buildings should be retained to provide a sense of space which is important to the character of an area*”. We contend given the layout that despite the proposed extension being built up to the legal boundary (no physical boundary on site) still ensures a good level of space between dwellings. The gap between the existing gable of the subject property and adjacent properties, Nos. 11 & 15 is 12.8meters. The proposed extension reduces this gap to 10.3meters. This separation is made up of effectively three differing parking area and small front gardens/soft landscaping, see photo attached to this email. This we contend is acceptable.

The SPD goes on to state;

Two-storey side extensions should:

- *not take up all or most of the space to the side of a house;*
- *maintain a 1 metre gap to the side boundary to ensure the building is not too close to a neighbouring property;*
- *and be set back at least 500mm from the front wall of the house.*

Whilst the proposed extension does extend up to the side legal boundary it still leaves good space separation and its highly unlikely the adjoining space will be developed, a terracing effect will not result. The proposed extension is not located ‘*too close to a neighbouring property*’. Indeed it’s clear when looking at other recent and historic extensions in the immediate locality others have exceeded what we are proposing here. The proposed frontage of the extension is set back 2.5 from the principle front elevation (porch) and 1.1m back from the main front two storey elevation of the original house, more than double the recommended distance.

The SPD states; “*Spaces between houses, including driveways, are important in providing a sense of space, local character and attractive appearance of an area and should be retained. Two-storey and first floor side extensions can cause a negative impact on the street when used to close the gap between semi-detached or detached houses. This can create a terracing effect in a non-terraced street*” Whilst this policy clearly only relates to semi-detached and detached properties, this subject property and indeed the surrounding properties, the No. 10-20 terrace and No. 11-23 terrace are all terraced properties NOT semi-detached or detached. Notwithstanding this, this proposed side extension clearly does not close the gap between properties.

The SPD states; “*Two-storey and first floor side extensions should: ideally be visually smaller in relation to the original house; be set back at least 500mm from the front of the original house to provide a vertical break from the roof plane and for the lowering of the ridgeline from the original house; have a roof design that follows the form of the existing roof; and retain a gap of at least 1 metre to boundary walls to avoid a terracing effect and to retain rear access to gardens.*” The proposed extension is visually smaller in relation to the original property (the proposed width is less than half the width of the existing house). The set back, from the principle elevation is more than double the recommended distance, the ridge line is clearly lower than existing. Rear gardens are retained, actually increased in size as a result of the proposals, and despite not being 1m from boundaries the proposal does not create a terracing effect.

Other considerations, in line with the Kirklees SPD (Supplementary Planning Documents) made when preparing these amendments are, but not limited to;

Local context and character.

Key design principle 1: Local character and street scene

Extensions and alterations to residential properties should be in keeping with the appearance scale design and local character of the area and the street scene

We contend the proposed design and materials along with openings reflects the existing and local character.

The Original House

Key design principle 2: Impact on the original house

Extensions should not dominate or be larger than the original house and should be in keeping with the existing building in terms of scale, materials and detail.

As noted above the proposed extension is less than half the width of the existing property and has a set back of more than double the recommended 500mm. Scale, Materials and detailing respects the existing property and does not dominate it.

Neighbouring properties

Key design principle 3: Privacy

Extensions and alterations should be designed to achieve reasonable levels of privacy for both inhabitants, future occupants and neighbours.

The only side window is the high level garage/store window. This, we contend, results in no impact on privacy of both the property occupants/future property occupants and other nearby property occupants.

Neighbouring properties

Key design principle 4: Habitable rooms and side windows

Extensions and alterations should consider the design and layout of habitable and non-habitable rooms to reduce conflict between neighbouring properties relating to privacy, light and outlook.

Habitable rooms, specifically openings are incorporated in elevations where existing habitable room windows are. This does not negatively impact on privacy, outlook or light.

Overshadowing and loss of light

Key design principle 5: Overshadowing/loss of light

Extensions and alterations should not adversely affect the amount of natural light presently enjoyed by a neighbouring property.

Considering the sun path, reduced height of the proposed side extension and the space separation we contend overshadowing and loss of light will not result.

Overbearing impact

Key design principle 6: Preventing overbearing impact

Extensions and alterations should not unduly reduce the outlook from a neighbouring property.

We contend the proposed extension does not unduly reduce the outlook from any neighbouring properties

Outdoor space

Key design principle 7: Outdoor space

Extensions and alterations should ensure an appropriately sized and useable area of private outdoor space is retained. Normally at least half the garden area should be retained as part of the proposals.

The outdoor space is not impacted on in any way. The property a three bedroomed property, as existing and proposed requires two off street parking spaces in accordance with the KMC planning highways guide. The existing garage is of a substandard size to be classed as a parking space, the side driveway is disproportionately (over 16.3m

long) is hard paved and not physically separated from the neighbouring drive. This serves to prevent this space from being used as external amenity space. Indeed the removal of the garage will add a significant additional area of secure external amenity/garden space to the property.

Energy Efficiency

Key design principle 8:

Energy efficiency Extensions and alterations should, where practicable, maximise energy efficiency.

The openings maximise energy efficiency. The new enhanced building regulations, in relation to thermal efficiency, will be adhered to therefore encapsulating the bulk of the existing side uninsulated wall with a thermally efficient insulated wall. This will reduce the carbon footprint of the property when considering the use of fossil fuels for heating.

Materials

Key design principle 9: Construction materials

Extensions and alterations should seek to use innovative construction materials and techniques, including reclaimed and recycled materials where possible.

The materials replicate and match existing and those used locally. The removal of the existing outer leaf not only create additional width internally but also releases this weathered artificial stone for reuse on the front elevation to ensure a seamless match of material.

Parking

Key design principle 15: Provision for parking

Extensions and alterations should maintain appropriate access and off-street 'in curtilage' parking.

Considering the length of the existing driveway its easily possible, as demonstrated on the photos on the proposed floor plan and elevations, to retain one parking space to the front of the proposed garage/store. Another separate/independent space is also provided to the front of the property (see photo of proposed floor/elevation drawing). Therefore the property retains two off street parking spaces, all in accordance with the KMC planning highway design guide. The proposed garage/store is substandard in size to be considered as a formal parking space within but provide excellent and secure space for items associated with normal garage storage space (

Kirklees Council has not set local parking standards for residential and non-residential development. However, as an initial point of reference for residential developments (unless otherwise evidenced using the criteria in Para. 5.1), it is considered that new:

- 2 to 3 bedroom dwellings provide a minimum of two off-street car parking spaces
- 4+ bedroom dwellings provide three off-street spaces.
- 1-2 bedroom apartments provide one space (3+ bed two spaces)

In most circumstances, one visitor space per 4 dwellings is considered appropriate. One cycle space per unit is recommended. The council can advise on provision for other uses. Further guidance can be found [here](#):

Bin storage and collection point

Key design principle 16: Provision for waste storage

Extensions and alterations should maintain appropriate storage arrangements for waste.

The proposals do not negatively impact on the storage or collection of waste, bin storage has been considered and is indicated on the plans.

Finally in addressing the currently registered objections against the application I respond as follows;

- ❖ *This is yet another application where someone has moved into a property that's too small for them, thus imposing noise, disturbance, encroachment and inconvenience on others, with an intention of selling and moving on...a typical builder's money spinning idea. This will also put extra pressure on roadside parking.*
 - o Parking complies with KMC policy
 - o Hours of construction works can, as traditionally are, conditioned
 - o Other points are not remotely a material consideration
- ❖ *Parking is already a massive issue. Frequently bin men have troubles getting up the street. Also concerned about the dirt and dust blowing into our property. Access to 3 more houses will be blocked by the development so will all have to find alternate parking.*
 - o Parking complies with KMC policy

- o Current bin collection issues resulting from other factors not relating to this property or these proposals.
- o All works to be carried out on land within the applicants ownership, access to other properties totally unaffected and a wholly inaccurate allegation.
- o Dirt/Dust not a material planning consideration

❖ *I am writing to formally object to the proposed planning permission for the two-storey extension. While I appreciate the importance of development and progress, I have significant concerns regarding the impact this extension may have on the local community, particularly in relation to traffic safety and access issues.*

My main objection stems from the location of the property, which is situated on a tight bend on a narrow road. Currently, the area has already overcrowded parking due to the narrow road, close proximity of neighbouring houses, and the fact that every house on the street has at least two vehicles and single driveways. The addition of a two-storey extension to the property will worsen the existing parking issues as the owner's plan to build on their much-needed drive, currently accommodating a car and a van.

The proposed extension raises concerns about the increased strain on the parking situation, especially the potential impact on emergency services, as the narrow road and limited access could impede the swift response of emergency vehicles. In situations requiring urgent medical attention, fire response, or other emergencies, timely access is crucial, and the proposed extension may compromise this.

Additionally, the increased strain on parking may affect routine services, such as bin emptying. The accessibility of waste management services in the area could be hindered by the extension, further contributing to the overall challenges faced by the community.

Furthermore, the extension, if approved, would dramatically reduce access to neighbouring properties, due to the two-storey extension being built on a corner plot where access is already limited, causing inconvenience and potential disputes among residents.

Considering these concerns, I urge the planning committee to carefully consider the impact of the proposed extension on the existing parking and traffic conditions, as well as the safety of residents and pedestrians in the area. I believe that approving this application would further exacerbate the already challenging situation and negatively affect the quality of life for those living in close proximity.

- o This property, as indicated, both with parking spaces and photos of two large domestic vehicles, has two off street parking spaces. The applicants have two vehicles.
- o The proposals comply with KMC highways standards.
- o Emergency services, fire service access all unaffected by these proposals.
- o Proposals have no negative impact on bin emptying. To be perfectly clear the proposals are sited on land within the applicants ownership and not on the public highway. Therefore this application has no negative impact on access for bins/refuse vehicles and/or emergency services.
- o The property is not a corner plot. The proposed works are all sited on land within the applicants ownership which has no right of access over for other properties therefore, the allegation that *if approved, would dramatically reduce access to neighbouring properties* is totally inaccurate and unfounded.

❖ *I am objecting to this proposed extension. The extension will overbear and encroach right up to the property boundaries of two neighbouring houses and make the use of one neighbour's access impossible during the months of building work and then problematic when the work is completed. It will convert a three-bed semi-detached with three parking spaces into a four-bed semi with only one parking space. The owner has two vehicles, a car and a van. This development will increase*

on-street parking in a close where the road is very narrow, has no pavements, and is already littered with residents cars and vans. Bin collections are already being missed when the refuse vehicle is unwilling to negotiate the road due to the amount of on-street parking which will only be added to by this development.

- o Overbearing? This is a subjective comment and one we consider inaccurate given the space separation, topography and established evergreen boundary treatment.
- o The proposals in no way prevent access impossible, even during the course of the proposed construction works. As noted on the plans the proposed extension can be scaffolded within and walled overhand ensuring the neighbouring drive is kept totally clear and accessible at all times.
- o It the proposed development creates problematic access when work is completed but not as existing then this suggest the complainant has been unlawfully using the applicants land to gain access to their land/property. Most probably not a material planning consideration.
- o The proposals comply with KMC highways standards.

❖ *Reference: 2023/93649 Comment: We would want to ensure that the addition of the extension does not cause any issues to the right of access for the surrounding properties. Particularly that no car should be allowed to park in front of the proposed garage as this would block access which other properties have rights over. This would cause increasing pressure on parking and breach legal rights as the neighbouring properties have shared access over such area. This would also need to be considered when the extension is being built, e.g scaffolding, building vans etc.*

- o The proposals are to be executed on land within the applicant's sole ownership, this does not impact on the rights of access for others over other land outside the applicants ownership/control.
- o The proposals comply with KMC highways standards.
- o Access to others land/properties is not being blocked or hindered.

I trust the above forms part of the application consideration and look forward to hearing back from you in due course, when you've carried out your site visit and assessed the revised proposals.

In the meantime can you please ask for the business support team to amend the details according to note me as agent will all communication/correspondence coming to me, via email.

Regards,

Paul

Paul Matthews Bsc (Hons) C.Build E MCABE

PAUL MATTHEWSARCHITECTURAL^{Ltd}

Malkin Farm
Brow Lane
Holmfirth
HD9 2RJ

www.paulmatthewsarchitectural.co.uk
<https://www.facebook.com/paulmatthewsarchitectural>

Company Registration Number: 09898149 - Company Registered in England and Wales

This e-mail message may contain confidential or legally privileged information and is intended only for the use of the intended recipient(s). Any unauthorized disclosure, dissemination, distribution, copying or the taking of any action in reliance on the information herein is prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please notify sender by telephone or email and delete all copies immediately.

Security Warnings - This email has been created in the knowledge that Internet email is not always a 100% secure communications medium. Anyone who communicates with us by e-mail is deemed to have accepted these risks. All liability for any claims arising as a result of using this medium to transmit information by us or to us is excluded to the extent permitted by law.