

DCAdmin

From:
Sent: 13 May 2024 17:51
To: DCAdmin
Subject: RE: 8, Westfield Court, Mirfield, WF14 9PT 2024/90637

I note that there are amended plans for the planning application for no 8.

My comments below still stand.

There is no detail around the demolition of the garage or final treatment. Land within the ownership of house no 10 has not been addressed. The massing comment also still stands.

Significant excavation works to the rear of the property have taken place with soil and sub-soil removed and vegetation either burnt on site or removed.

I look forward to hearing from you and building control.

Kind regards,

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows

From:
Sent: 19 April 2024 17:00
To: dc.admin@kirklees.gov.uk
Subject: 8, Westfield Court, Mirfield, WF14 9PT 2024/90637

Dear Mathias,

Please can you take the following comments into consideration when determining planning application no 2024/90637.

The application states that the existing garage is to be demolished. The left side as viewed from the road (North - West elevation) is a retaining wall with the path from the neighbour's property. This path is approximately 1.1m higher than the base of the wall. It cannot be demolished unless it is replaced. The method of working and any final solution will need to be agreed with the owner of house no 10 and be signed off by a competent engineer with a party wall agreement in place before work commences. The corner and part of the front face of the garage also acts as a retaining wall with no 10 with the same comments as above to apply.

The proposed extension is to be built within 3m of the gable end of house no 10. Due to the proximity and levels difference, consideration must be given to the stability of no 10 during and after construction with a party wall agreement in place before the works commence.

Part of the planning application area is not owned by the applicant but is owned by the adjoining owner at house no 10; therefore Section 11 of the application is incorrect. The existing ground floor plan no. 2024/442/02 is incorrect as the boundary with no. 10 is shown as a straight line from the North- West elevation of the garage wall to the highway. The actual property boundary kicks back in, in front of the existing garage by approximately 40 cm. This property boundary with house no 10 and the existing stone wall must remain. This wall has been in place for over 20

years and the land used exclusively, for the whole of this period, by no 10. The same incorrect property line is shown on the proposed site plan. Consideration both in terms of design and also in terms the engineering treatment of the retaining wall of the garage and its relationship with the stone wall from no 10 must be detailed and agreed with the planners and no 10 before commencement of the works.

The scale and massing of the property is not in keeping with the streetscape. Westfield Court is characterised by detached properties with significant space between each property either at ground floor or single storey level. The proposed extension will completely plug the gap with the loss of this space and break the character of the streetscape, changing the visual identity of this small cul-de-sac. The building is also huge for the size of the plot and would look totally out of keeping with the remainder of the houses on the street spoiling the tone, uniqueness and collective appearance of all the houses, gardens, and landscaping along the street.

Please can there be a condition that no building works or movement of materials happens before 8.00am and that the house continues to be used as a residential property and not used for a business?

Please contact me if you would like to discuss any of the above.

Kind regards,

10, Westfield Court,
Mirfield
WF14 9PT