STODDART
ARCHITECTURE

Studio at The Old Manse
108 Huddersfield Road
Brighouse
West Yorkshire
HD6 3RH

Dear Planning Services, Kirklees Council,

Re: Formal Objection – Application Ref. 2025/62/92309/E – Proposed development at 39/39A Beckett Road, Dewsbury, WF13 2DD

I write on behalf of my client, the owner/occupier of the neighbouring property to the above site, to object to the proposed development on the grounds of over-development of the plot and unacceptable harm to neighbouring residential amenity, notably loss of daylight/sunlight and increased overshadowing to my client's home and garden.
This objection draws on the applicant's submission (location/block plan; existing and proposed plans; tree survey/constraints plan; preliminary bat assessment) and the Kirklees Local Plan, House Extensions & Alterations SPD, and the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

1) Over-development and poor design (LP24; House Extensions SPD)
The proposed footprint and two-storey massing read as disproportionate to the plot, with development pushing hard to the side and rear. The SPD expects extensions to be subservient, set back at least 500mm from the front wall, maintain a minimum 1m gap to side boundaries, and retain at least half of the garden as usable private space. On the evidence submitted, the scheme erodes side spacing and consumes a substantial share of the plot, creating the risk of a "terracing" effect. This conflicts with Policy LP24 and the SPD's design principles.

2) Harm to neighbouring amenity – overshadowing, overbearing and loss of light (LP24; SPD)
My client's principal windows and garden stand to suffer a material loss of daylight/sunlight and increased overshadowing from the enlarged two-storey envelope close to the boundary, contrary to LP24. The SPD requires minimum separation distances (21m between opposing habitable rooms; 12m to a blank gable) to avoid overbearing and protect amenity. No daylight/sunlight analysis has been provided, so the LPA cannot be satisfied that the scheme preserves neighbour amenity.

3) Trees and landscape (LP33; BS5837)
The tree survey shows trees/groups near boundaries with Root Protection Areas overlapping the working area. At least one boundary group is identified for felling "to accommodate redevelopment." This would result in loss of established screening and harm to local character, contrary to Policy LP33. A full Tree Protection Plan and Arboricultural Method Statement (BS5837) are required.

4) Ecology and lighting (LP30; NPPF)
The Preliminary Bat Roost Assessment identifies low roost potential with roost opportunities in roof crevices, and recommends mitigation and enhancement (bat boxes, sensitive working methods). These must be secured by condition alongside a lighting strategy to avoid disturbance, in accordance with LP30 and the NPPF's biodiversity objectives.

RIBA
Chartered Practice

STODDART
ARCHITECTURE

Studio at The Old Manse
108 Huddersfield Road
Brighouse
West Yorkshire
HD6 3RH

Policy summary

- LP24 (Design) – conflict: overbearing massing, poor spacing, loss of amenity.
- House Extensions SPD – conflict: spacing, garden loss, separation distances.
- LP33 (Trees) – conflict: loss of boundary trees and inadequate protection.
- LP30 (Biodiversity) – conflict unless mitigation/lighting measures secured.
- NPPF (Well-designed places / Natural environment) – conflict due to amenity loss, poor design quality, and insufficient evidence on light impact.

Conclusion

The proposal represents over-development of the site and would cause unacceptable harm to my client's amenity through overshadowing, overbearing impact and loss of daylight/sunlight. It also risks harm to trees and biodiversity.

For these reasons, the proposal should be refused. If, notwithstanding the above, the LPA is minded to approve, robust conditions should be imposed to control materials, protect trees, mitigate ecological harm, and require daylight/sunlight testing in line with BRE 209.

With kind regards,