

Address: 23 Darnley Close Holmfirth HD94BT

Search application details

Application number: 2024/93114	
What is the application for?:	Demolition of existing garage and link structure and erection of two storey side
Address of the site or building:	21, Darnley Close, Meltham, Holmfirth, HD9 4BT
Postcode:	HD9 4BT

User comments

Type of comment: An objection	
Do you wish your comments to be published on the website anonymously?	No
There has been no verbal consultation by Mr McNulty in regards to any alterations which may affect my property, the first indication of which was from Kirklees Council regarding an Application for Planning Permission before the discovery of a single sheet posted through my letterbox over a week later on Nov 16th. I'm very disappointed that common courtesy wasn't shown in regards to discussing his plans/ideas with me. The original plans from 1986 made provision for three properties - two with double garages, one with single, with restricted access on a joint right of way. There wasn't enough space for another garage as number 21 occupies a very cramped position with number 19 with only enough space for said single garage; in fact access would have been easier if only two houses rather than three had been built in the first place as a wider driveway and parking would have been possible. It is, however, as it is. Unfortunately the plans produced by Mr McNulty's architect are very misleading as it suggests a wide, easy access stretching to the boundary fences and with plenty of room for manoeuvrability, which most certainly it isn't. It cannot be emphasized enough as to how tight the entrance curve in front of number 23 on to the drive actually is. The shared driveway as originally designed is restricted and entrance/exit relies to some extent on cooperation between neighbours as there is insufficient space for vehicles to turn on their own driveway sections, and the tight curves of the driveway, (not shown on the recent architect's plan) make reversing out to be hazardous. Plus there is a drop of over a metre from the driveway down the hillside towards number 64 on Mill Bank Road below, on the outside of a curve with a relatively steep camber outside Mr McNulty's house. On at least two occasions since 1986 vehicles have gone down this slope and through the fence onto number 64's property. I assume that is one of the reasons a row of Leylandii were planted in that location by one of the owners – I don't know if it was by the present owner. I view with disquiet the suggestion of a parking bay immediately adjacent to my land	

I view with disquiet the suggestion of a parking bay immediately adjacent to my land and protruding out onto what is, as can be seen, the driveway which is a shared right of way. Any vehicle parked there, even if back to the bay window of 21 will mean a narrowing of access to 19 and 21 to only slightly wider than the width of a vehicle. It is difficult at present for vehicles larger than a car to access the driveway so delivery vehicles, ambulances, etc. would not be able to get through to 19 and 21 even if it is only a smaller car parked in that bay. Incidentally, Mr McNulty's bay window isn't shown on the plan provided. Parking a car in this bay will require anyone parking in front of my left-hand garage to undertake awkward reversing manoeuvres to leave the site or perform a reversing manoeuvre on arriving in the cul-de-sac onto the drive around the tight curves to number 23.

No permission will be granted for vehicles to park outside the original boundaries as drawn up on the title deeds for number 23, viz, a continuing straight line leading from the end of the left-hand garage to the bottom fence.

Although it doesn't directly affect number 23, at present it is only through good will that number 19 can manoeuvre their vehicles out of their corner because of the problems already mentioned. It would seem that the extension of Mr McNulty's garage forwards on a cramped site to allow larger new rooms above will adversely affect the ability of number 19 to gain access to/from their own drive.

The extension above the garage doesn't directly affect number 23 either, but the storage of construction materials, skips, and constructor's vehicles will need careful management with a lot of disruption on the shared drive. Number 21 is on a very compact site and the space available for working in is limited to the area in front of Mr McNulty's present garage adjacent to number 19's property, so presumably materials including roof frames will need to be stored at the end of the cul-de-sac and brought around to number 21 when needed. As the intended extension takes shape, there will be even less space for the constructors to work in. The movement of heavy or awkward materials is of concern and I expect care to be taken to avoid damage to my trees (which have TPO protection) and to the bushes and shrubs which line the sides of the driveway and cul-de-sac. It is impossible for large skip vehicles to access the drive. In the past because of the tight curves on the drive, vehicles took 'short cuts' across the lawns that were there, hence the planting of my hedges. I would expect care to be taken to try and ensure no damage, and any accidental damage to the vegetation or the driveway itself to be made good.

In conclusion, my major concern is the construction of a parking bay adjacent to my property which restricts an already cramped driveway and makes manoeuvring off my property more difficult. If Mr McNulty is able to manage without such a bay, is able to build an extension without creating permanent problems for number 19, and minimises the disruption for all of us during the construction period, I would support his planning application and hope he and his family will be very happy there.