

2nd December 2024

To whom it may concern

Your Ref; 2024/92442

**Planning application for 87, Briarlyn Road, Birchencliffe, Huddersfield, HD3 3NW
Erection of two storey front and side extensions and single storey rear extensions.**

I have reviewed the online information on the Kirklees website regarding the above Planning Application. In the light of my previously submitted objection commentary there are some points I would like to raise on matters contained within the Delegated Report and subsequent Officer's Response.

Section on Two Storey Front & Side Extensions:

Retain a gap of at least 1 metre to boundary walls to avoid a terracing effect and to retain rear access to gardens

- This has been designated as "No – Justify" as a 700mm gap it retained
- The justification provided is:
 - a) This is considered acceptable due to the host property sitting on a higher ground level to neighbouring property number 85
 - b) Number 85 has a similar extension closer to the boundary line and therefore it would not be reasonable to refuse the application on this basis
- I would like to refer you back to my previous letter dated 7th October 2024, where I brought to your attention that the previous extension and building work to number 87 had encroached on the boundary bringing into need an indent in the wall to allow refuse bin access which would take the boundary to 1 metre.
- The fact that number 87 is on higher ground has implications for loss of light and potential issues with damp which I feel negates the mitigation offered.

Highways and Parking:

Impact on highway safety

- The further comment states "Parking is predominantly provided on-street and in curtilage at the rear, which remains acceptable due to the location of this property and the neighbouring houses – off the main through-fare. The property also has a rear driveway big enough to fit a car after the construction of the proposed extension."
- Based on the plans submitted, the "curtilage at the rear" will no longer be accessible as the extension will block the access and therefore no longer provide "a rear driveway big enough to fit a car after the construction of the proposed extension", unless the occupiers have access to a vehicle that can shrink to 700mm wide. I feel this needs more explanation

I also have some additional questions related to the application:

Multi Occupancy

1. What is the planning process required to change the use of the property to multi occupancy as suggested in the Officers Response to Objection 1?
2. As Platinum Letting is named as the applicant, does this suggest the property is going to be used for multi occupancy, and that there will be a cyclical change of residents?

Parking

3. What are the appropriate measures to manage any potential parking issues as suggested in the Officers Response to Objection 1?

Party Wall Act 1996

4. As the Party Wall Act is mentioned specifically in the Council Document Review, does this apply for my property? And if so, how will Kirklees Council seek to ensure all "necessary steps will be taken to comply with the Act"?

Building Control

5. If the Applicant changed to a private concern, which I understand can occur, would relevant documentation be available on the Kirklees website in the light of transparency?

I look forward to your response.

Yours sincerely,