About the application

Application number: 2025/92181	
What is the application for?:	Erection of rear extension and raising of roof at front with front dormers
Address of the site or building:	382, Huddersfield Road, Mirfield, WF14 9DL
Postcode:	WF14 9DL

User comments

Type of comment: An objection	
Do you wish your comments to be published on the website anonymously?	Yes

Planning Objection Letter
Development Management
Kirklees Council
Planning Services

Application Reference: [Insert Reference if available]
Site Address: 382 Huddersfield Road, Mirfield, WF14 9DL

Dear Sir/Madam,

I wish to lodge a formal and strong objection to the above planning application for the proposed development at 382 Huddersfield Road, Mirfield, WF14 9DL.

1. Retrospective and Misleading Application

The application is wholly inaccurate and misleading. Works have already significantly commenced on site, with the development nearing completion prior to permission being granted. Furthermore, demolition was undertaken in an unsafe and reckless manner, putting the public and neighbouring homeowners at significant risk. This directly contravenes the requirement for transparency and proper process under the NPPF (para. 39–42: decision-making) and undermines public trust in the planning system.

2. Unclear and Misrepresented Proposed Use

The application fails to clearly state the proposed use of the property. The building has been vacant for over 20 years, and no justification has been provided for how the new use complies with sustainable development objectives under NPPF Chapter 2 and Kirklees Local Plan Strategic Objective SO1 (promoting sustainable growth). This lack of clarity makes it impossible to assess the impacts appropriately.

3. Overbearing Impact on Public Right of Way (PROW)

3. Overbearing Impact on Public Right of Way (PROW)

The property sits directly on the boundary of a public right of way. The works are overbearing and create a harmful sense of enclosure, contrary to Kirklees Local Plan Policy LP31 (strategic routes and PROWs). It is unclear how construction could take place without encroaching onto or obstructing the PROW, in conflict with NPPF para. 100, which requires protection and enhancement of public rights of way.

4. Harm to Residential Amenity

The close proximity to the northern boundary (approx. 8m) results in unacceptable impacts on neighbouring residential amenity through visual intrusion and overbearing mass. This contravenes Kirklees Local Plan Policy LP24(b), which requires developments to ensure they do not have an adverse impact on residential amenity, as well as NPPF para. 130(f), which seeks to create places with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users.

5. Unclear and Inadequate Plans

The submitted drawings are misleading and incomplete. The rear elevation is subterranean and not accurately depicted, making it impossible to properly assess the scheme. This lack of clarity conflicts with NPPF para. 31, which requires that decisions are based on accurate and proportionate information.

6. Parking Concerns

No provision for off-street parking has been included. The site is not within a defined town centre and has no off-road parking, leading to inevitable on-street parking pressures. This is contrary to Kirklees Local Plan Policy LP22 and NPPF para. 110–112, which require developments to provide safe and suitable access and ensure that parking provision is properly managed.

7. Out-of-Character Design

The proposed dormer roof design is wholly out of keeping with the character of Huddersfield Road and fails to respect the established street scene. This contravenes Kirklees Local Plan Policy LP24(a) (design) and NPPF para. 130(c), which require developments to be visually attractive and sympathetic to local character.

Conclusion
For the above reasons, the application is fundamentally flawed and non-compliant with both the Kirklees Local Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework. It would cause significant harm to residential amenity, highway safety, local character, and public rights of way. I therefore urge the Council to refuse this application in its entirety.