

23/10/24

To:
Kirklees Council

Dear Sir/Madam

Re: Objection Letter. 2024/91834

Once again I wish to object to the proposed development next door to my family's home. This saga has now been running since 2022 and is causing undue stress and suffering both physically and mentally on myself and family.

The new (amended) application is merely a few very slight changes that hopes to appease the planning department in order to pass an almost identical plan from the previous year. Once again I wish to put on record that the case officer has only visited this site once back in 2022 and met with the Architect and property owner to advise them on the requirements prior to the initial application being withdrawn.

I have asked for a site visit as I do not believe the plans/drawings to be an accurate representation of the scale of the plot, or size and distances between the buildings. Again, this was refused as apparently not part of the process. How can the planning department make an informed decision when looking at a proposal with drawings and measurements that are wrong ?

My objections which are still current and valid from the last objection are included below along with supplementary / supporting objection from an independent body who I have employed to support the objection process and any further processes if so required. It is in this document that there is more emphasis on your previous reasons for refusal 1 & 3.

I wish to also make public that I employed an independent site surveyor who has taken measurements of the current site and building and compared them with the proposed plans and has confirmed there are major discrepancies with the measurements and proposals in the way that it dampens down the actual proposed building size by implying the current house is larger than it actually is, there is also drawing errors to the west elevation and the rear of the plans in comparison.

If this hasn't been identified by the case officer I feel that it is negligent and this plan should go to a committee review and if possible have myself present to represent my objection.

The new amendments again DO NOT change the fact that that the dwelling IS cramped..

It still fails and the proposal would not accord with Policies LP1, LP2, LP11 and LP24(a) of the Kirklees Local Plan, Principles 2, 5, and 6 of the Housebuilders Design Guide SPD and Chapter 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

This is what it was rejected for initially.

The slight movement of the dwelling by only 31.5 cm on the side of 384 Bradley road (my family home) does not in any way help alleviate the OVERBEARING EFFECT. Again this was refused by yourselves.. The house is 10m tall, what does 31.5 cm actually do to help? I lose my view, my natural light and the heat from the sun that warms my house. Not to mention my much deserved privacy.

There has been NO REASONABLE ADJUSTMENTS to change these plans to make the dwelling less cramped. The owners are again disregarding anyone's feelings for their own personal gain.

I was really proud that the last refusal was granted and an extensive rationale was given. From follow up emails it now appears you have been working hand in hand to "tweak" the design in order to pass the application. This is why i feel this MUST go to an independent committee review.

Below is your refusal statement... If by moving the dwelling back ever so slightly meets the 2 meter requirement the sheer size defenately doesn't appease the requirement for loss of outlook as highlighted...

The proposed residential development, by virtue of its location, scale, massing and orientation of the proposed dwelling to a kitchen window within adjacent neighbouring property no. 384 Bradley Road, it is considered that the proposals would have an overbearing impact upon the residential amenity of the occupiers of no. 384 Bradley Road, **resulting in a loss of outlook and light**. To permit such a development would be contrary to policy LP24 (b) of the Kirklees Local Plan, Principle 6 of the Council's adopted Housebuilders Design Guide SPD and Chapter 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Again.... The mock up of the 3-car diagram is similar to my daughter's primary school work with tracks and prints. We can't be that naive to think a colossal house will only have only 3 cars outside. If passed I will be regularly observing dangerous actions with cars reversing onto the main road. Again, this sketch does not demonstrate that the application site can be accessed effectively and safely by all users.

Subject: Objecting to planning application 2024/91834

Impact on Visual Amenity...

Looking at the design of the house and the sheer size I believe it would look out of place sat in between a bungalow and 2 semi detached houses which have been there for well over 60 years.

Highway Safety...

Even though the plans for the house show 5 bedrooms it is pretty obvious than the office and snug on the ground floor could easily be bedrooms and also the huge storage area in the loft could indeed be a bedroom we are potentially looking at a 8+ bedroom house. The amount of vehicles wouldn't support the amount of parking space that's required therefore requiring roadside parking on a main 40mph speed limit road. This would not be allowed so then cars would be parked on grass verges to elevate the congestion.

*****Showing a diagram and traffic flow chart of just 3 vehicles is not representative of a realistic simulation for a house of this size*****

Noise...

As we are looking at a huge house neighbouring ours with what has been described in the planning application as a growing family again the amount of noise created by the cars in the drive would be never-ending. Usually with houses as big as this they come with large plots and therefore neighbours aren't just a few feet away like we are.

Overshadowing / loss of light...

This is massive in my appeal. Whilst in the application states...

"The height and massing of the house have been designed to be considerate of neighbouring properties. The ridge of the roofs runs from north to south, so the roof pitches to the east and west to minimize the impact on neighbouring houses on these sides."

This new house plan would MASSIVELY reduce the natural light coming through both my kitchen window (the only non south facing window in the kitchen). It would also reduce the amount of natural light entering my upstairs landing window and totally remove my east view of the sunrise and any landscape. So no view and natural light, this would then require me to pay for very expensive utilities to light my house to compensate for the light lost. I have enclosed photos of my current conditions for consideration.

***** Again, moving the footprint back on a house you have rejected last year for being overbearing and too large for the plot by only a foot will not have any serious benefits to improve the natural light*****

Loss of Privacy...

Again a huge concern with a family and only 1 bathroom in the house the landing window would be overlooked for the 3 west facing roof windows, these would be possibly level or slightly higher than our landing window which would be even worse for privacy.

Our privacy in our back garden would also be eliminated due to the new proposed house.

The windows in the proposed kitchen and lounge would also look into our house again removing our privacy.

At the moment there are NO windows that look into our house from neighbouring properties, this was the main reason for buying this home for my family.

In summary to the proposed application...

I have no objection to any redevelopment that would be of the same height of the current house.

I have no objection to an increased footprint from the current building, I do however have concerns with the architects' drawings and how accurate the measurements are, in relation to gaps between the houses, height, length, driveway etc. "Design and Access Statement" document, look at the 1246 measurement to the existing garage.... From this measurement a car would not pass and from the photo included one definitely does.

In the "Design and Access Statement" document, to try give weight to the application there are some images of neighbouring houses with out-buildings or extensions.. I must point out ALL of these are single story buildings or extensions.

And in reference to the different houses on the area, these photos are over a wide distance spread on Bradley road over a vast period of time so there is naturally going to be a variety, with planning regulations improving the is now more protection for neighbouring houses and especially around the loss of light.

I also appreciate there has been a revision to the last application but going from a gigantic house to a massive house doesn't then make this application suitable, I do find it disappointing with the supporting evidence that it states the house arrangement does not work for the family's needs.

The family who are applying have never lived in the house and if this was the case, then why not buy a house that did suit there needs instead of one that needed demolishing only to be replaced with one that clearly doesn't fit on the plot size.

A house of this stature 5 if not 8 bedrooms 3 bathrooms, snugs, offices and walk in wardrobes should be on a large enough plot that it doesn't massively impact the area and more specifically the neighbours either side of the huge overbearing house.

I plead with you to AGAIN reject this application and encourage a more suitably sized house to be built.

Images for reference... 1st two are landing view and NATURAL light east facing, would be totally blocked by new house. The roof you can see is the current house on the site.

2nd two are showing large amount of natural light entering the kitchen from the east, this would be totally eliminated with a 2 story house. Privacy into these windows would be compromised.

Last 2 show how the gradient of the road let the houses taper in height stepping down naturally and also how my only two east facing windows would be massively effected with the proposed house, I'd have NO view and a huge reduction in Natural light with the house being so close and high. Their proposal is for the new building to be of the same height as my home not taking into account the gradient of the road.



