

Sent:

06 November 2025 17:16

Re: Objection to Planning Application and Process 46 stockhill street Dewsbury -
2025/92608 & 2025/91871

Dear Kirklees Council,

Following your recent communications,

I am again writing as the adjacent occupier of 48 Stockhill Street to formally object to the proposed development at 46 Stockhill Street under planning application 2025/92608, and to raise serious concerns regarding the handling of prior applications, including 2025/91871.

1. Objection to the Proposed Development (2025/92608)

The proposed development includes a 1-metre increase in roof ridge height and a doubling of the bungalow's footprint, which is entirely out of character with the surrounding properties, including my own. Both properties were constructed at the same time and share a consistent architectural style. When I previously sought to make alterations to my property, I was explicitly informed that raising the roof ridge would not be permitted due to its impact on the character of the area. I was only permitted to install rear dormer windows.

This proposal is contrary to the following local planning policies:

- Kirklees Local Plan Policy LP24 (Design): Requires that developments respect and enhance the character of the townscape and be subservient to the original building, minimising impact on residential amenity.
- House Extensions and Alterations SPD (June 2021): Section 5.7 states that increasing the height of bungalows is usually not acceptable where roof heights in the street scene are consistent.

2. Failure to Notify Adjacent Occupiers

I raise a procedural complaint regarding the failure to notify me of the recent planning applications at 46 Stockhill street, including 2025/91871. As an adjacent occupier, I should have been notified in accordance with:

- Article 15 of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015, which requires notification of adjoining landowners.

- Kirklees Development Management Charter, which states that neighbour notification letters are to be sent to properties sharing a boundary with the application site.

The Council's own correspondence acknowledges that it cannot confirm whether such letters were dispatched. This is a clear breach of procedure and has denied me the opportunity to comment during the statutory consultation period.

What is even more shocking is the sign was posted on the opposite side of the street and no way near the subject property as proven by your own photograph.

3. Concerns Regarding Prior Approval (2025/91871)

The officer's report for application 2025/91871 concluded that the proposed height increase would have no significant impact on adjacent properties. I strongly dispute this conclusion. The 1-metre increase in roof height directly affects the visual amenity, privacy, and character of my property.

This conclusion appears to be irrational and unlawful, as it fails to properly consider the material impact on neighbouring properties. Judicial review may be pursued where a decision is:

- Illegal – if the planning officer misapplied planning law or policy.
- Irrational – if the decision defies logic or accepted planning standards.
- Procedurally improper – if due process, such as neighbour consultation, was not followed.

4. Conclusion

To summarise:

- I formally object to planning application 2025/92608.
- I raise a procedural complaint regarding the failure to notify me of recent applications at 46 Stockhill street.
- I dispute the planning officer's conclusion under 2025/91871 and reserve the right to pursue judicial review if necessary.

I request that my objections be formally recorded and considered in the determination of the current application. I also request a formal response to the procedural concerns raised above.