
5 Bradley Grange Gardens
Huddersfield
HD2 1QX

8th August 2024

FAO Lucy Taylor

Application number 2024/62/91912/W

For 15 years we have lived at 5 Bradley Grange Gardens, HD2 1QX, which is next door to 7 Bradley Grange Gardens.

We have the following reservations about the application and wish to lodge an objection/ raise concern.

Their existing plans note a drain running under the existing garage. Unfortunately, the plan does not show the existing live manhole which sits across the boundary between our properties and the direction of any pipes associated with it. The manhole has been bridged and is completely covered on their side. I have attached a photograph of the said manhole and can be inspected if required. We are unclear what implications this may have regarding inspection and repair of such.

A more pressing problem is that for the last 5 years we have noticed excess water seeping into our garden and washing away a significant amount of ground, which we continue to replace to no avail. For information, the land on their site has been built up and is approximately 4ft above our ground level. We have had a site visit from Yorkshire Water who have confirmed that this is not a problem arising from within our boundary and that potentially there may be a broken pipe next door. We approached our neighbours and offered to (free of charge) repair any damage to stop this problem. They refused and told us not to enter their property.

Additionally, the proposed elevations do not show any rainwater pipes or indications of how they will be removing rain water from the site. We notice from another objection (16 Steeplands) that this area is prone to underground streams and springs. Given our current damage to our property we are worried that a larger extension so close to our property could significantly worsen this. In their Appendix A Questions 5 & 6 they respond None and unknown. They are clearly aware of issues with water and impacts on neighbours, so should have made some commentary.

More concerning is that we believe the proposed plans are inaccurate. Their drawing indicates that the new extension will be 1050mm from our boundary fence and that their boundary is 900mm from the new extension. Our understanding is that the fence line is the boundary. The existing garage appears on their existing plan to a maximum of 2.8m wide and we suggest that it is currently closer than 1050mm from our fence; this could be checked on site relatively easily.

The plan indicates an internal measurement of the proposed extension of 2830mm plus a new external (insulated wall). To achieve the required U value of 0.18 W/(m²K) even with a full fill insulation this would be in the region of 280 – 300mm thickness, a new extension of + 3m this is clearly significantly wider than the existing garage. This will be considerably closer to our boundary (fence) than the 1050mm stated. It is crucial to understand exactly where the wall will be located for the following reasons:

1. The existing manhole may be located where the strip foundations will be required.
2. The soil condition is such that deep foundations may be required which could impact on the stability of our boundary wall and fence.
3. The space to enable scaffolding to be put up may need to be on our land which could seriously compromise our security and which we would require to be notified under the Party Wall Act.
4. The utility door and window will face directly onto our conservatory and at less than 1000mm from the boundary may not meet Approved Document B or could require additional fire resisting properties.

5. SPD House Extensions and Alterations 5.8 states that: Generally, two-storey rear extensions should: be separated from the property boundary, such as a wall, fence or hedge, by at least 1.5 metre; ...

The SPD House Extensions and Alterations 2.15 encourages applicants to discuss with neighbours before applying this has not happened, if they had done so we could have informed that about the manhole for instance and discussed our concerns with them.

Furthermore, there is no access statement explaining implications on our amenity, such as:

- loss of afternoon light in our conservatory (key design principle 5 Policy LP24 Design (b))
- privacy, the new kitchen and utility window overlook our garden and conservatory (SPD 4.15 - Side windows should not be included in extensions where they would unacceptably overlook neighbouring gardens or otherwise constrain the development potential of adjoining land. Note: their land is higher than ours and overlooking has more impact. A section would be helpful in this assessment.

We trust that the above explains our concerns and in summary:

- Can the dimensions of the proposal against the site conditions be checked.
- That the overlooking is addressed.
- And that if approval is granted that conditions apply to ensure that works will prevent water egress into our property.

Regards