

## DC Admin

---

**From:**  
**Sent:** 11 September 2025 22:08  
**To:** DC Admin  
**Subject:** Planning Application 2025/62/92206/E

**CAUTION:** External email. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Objection to Planning Application 2025/62/92206/E- 42 Robin Royd Lane, Mirfield, WF14 0LG

Dear Sir / Madam

As a resident of Wellhouse Lane, owning a house directly behind the site of the proposed development, on the south east aspect, it is clear from the proposed plans that our property and those adjoining have not been considered at all during the planning process.

With reference to planning document 1102268, no consideration has been made for the windows of habitable rooms on our property and, after consulting our own architect, are reliably informed that the current proposed plans leave only about 18 meters from facade to facade which directly contravenes the national guidelines of 21- 22metres and article 7.19 of the Kirklees House Builders design guide, '21 metres between facing windows of habitable rooms at the back of dwellings.' This, coupled with the rear facing Juliette balconies on each property, and many windows overlooking properties on Wellhouse Lane is completely unacceptable.

While there is scope to move the whole block forward, thus allowing for the recommended distance of 21- 22 meters at the rear, we believe this would then pose an issue with the parking designation for 2 vehicles as required on a 3 bedroom property. As there is no on street parking available due to the proposed design, this solution would result in a loss of viable and adequate parking, directly contravening policy LP22.

On the note of planned parking allocation, while the plan as it stands, does meet the requirements set out in the Kirklees Local Plan, realistically, parking will be an issue as Robin Royd Lane is a narrow cul de sac, so with no on street parking directly in front of the proposed development, there is a huge potential for issues arising with guests or visitors of the proposed properties, not to mention the very real likelihood of homeowners requiring space for more than 2 cars.

The proposed properties are marketed as 3 bed, 2 of which are double rooms, but with the 'study' to the second floor and the 'storeroom' to the ground floor there is potential for both rooms to, very easily be converted into further bedrooms increasing the likelihood of more adults and subsequently more vehicles. The current plan proposal would also cause issues should new homeowners wish to extend in a few years, which is a very likely possibility. The rear garden spaces only being around 8.8 meters, a permitted development of 3 meters to the rear would leave only a distance of 5.8 meters to the boundary wall and further impeding on our privacy.

The land directly behind the site, to the south east, directly beyond and leading up to the existing dry stone wall is private land to which the proposed properties have no legal access. The agent has not served mandatory land ownership certificates rendering the proposed gates illegal (reference planning document; 1099406, proposed landscaping and 1099401, proposed site / block layout). We therefore must insist that all plans for gateways through the dry stone wall and giving access to the rear gardens of the proposed development be removed and request that notes be made on the deeds of any property that is developed on this land highlighting this fact so that there is less potential for any problems arising with future homeowners wanting to put in their own gates.

With the gates omitted, the middle terraces will have no access to the rear private space other than through the property itself.

We do not agree that the development is sensitive to or in keeping with the already established and varied styles that exist surrounding the site. All properties built in the last century are 1-2 storeys, given the proposed style of red brick and render we believe the development will not only feel intrusive and block light for many surrounding neighbours but stand out visually offensively from the surrounding architecture, resembling a modern apartment complex with many windows and Juliette balconies and thus contravening LP24(a).

We would also argue that the existing building, being structurally sound and having stood for so long, is not beyond restoration, or at the end of its life cycle, as stated in question 2 of the climate change statement and would question the claim that it is more environmentally considerate to demolish than to restore. On the matter of the existing building, we are eager to know the findings or the advised bat emergence observances (reference page 12 of the Preliminary Ecological Appraisal Report, document id 1099408).

While we are not opposed to the land being developed, it is our opinion that the current proposal is over intensive and has been planned with complete disregard for existing homeowners surrounding the site and request that plans are refused or greatly altered to comply with statutory planning regulations and the adopted local plan in Kirklees.

Yours sincerely

N.B - please remove our personal information from this objection before publishing.