

47 Bank End Lane
Almondbury
HUDDERSFIELD
HD5 9PT

Planning Department
Kirklees Council
Civic Centre 3
Market Street
HUDDERSFIELD
HD1 2EY

20th November 2025

Dear Sir/Madam,

Objection to Planning Application 2025/62/92897/W – 49 Bank End Lane, Huddersfield HD5 8ES

I am writing to object to the above planning application concerning the neighbouring property at 49 Bank End Lane. As the immediate neighbour, I believe the proposed development will have a detrimental impact on my home and the wider community.

The basis of the application is a follow-up to 2025/HHPD/92310/W – a larger home extension application - which was granted earlier this year, however before I go into the later application, I have to question the validity of the decision of September 2025. The first I, and my other neighbours were aware that an application had been made was subsequent to its approval, when work began on site. This appears to be contrary to the consultation process, and given as the immediate neighbour I received no direct consultation, and when consulting with my other neighbours, that no notification was posted, it is unsurprising that there were no objections, given that you cannot object to something you know nothing about.

In relation to application 2025/62/92897/W, my objections focus on the following:

- Loss of Privacy and Light
- Overbearing & Intimidating Impact
- Noise and Disruption
- Parking and Traffic Concerns
- Streetscene
- Other issues

In raising these concerns I will refer to the Design & Access Statement prepared by Cadvis3D, which forms the basis of the application.

Loss of Privacy and Light

The vast size of the proposed extension, together with making it a two-storey extension will directly overlook my property, resulting in a significant loss of privacy. The proposed balcony will be in extreme proximity to my bedroom window, and given the extension is proposed to end one metre from the existing boundary, will extend a considerable distance further back compared to the rear of my property, and – because of the topography – is situated on higher ground than my property, it will also block natural light into my home and garden, reducing my enjoyment of the space. The report suggests that the applicant has suggested that a flat roof will minimise the impact on residential amenity and light. However, a two-storey extension that extends so close to my property, and as far back as the proposal will have far more impact than the choice of roof pitch.

Overbearing Impact

The scale and positioning of the development are disproportionate to the surrounding properties. Whilst other local properties have extended sideways, this application expands the property significantly on three sides. Also, as an _____, who has lived in my property since _____, I do not wish to have my final years feeling as though I am overbearingly overlooked by a neighbouring property, especially by a balcony that will be practically outside my bedroom window. The proposed extension will do just that, and is an unrealistic proposal. The Cadvis3D report states that

given the earlier application was approved that this has established that such a scale of extension is acceptable. I wholeheartedly disagree. Leaving aside the fact that I was not given the opportunity to raise any objections to that first application, this later application is a massive expansion on that application, and I refute the logic of the report that one leads naturally on to the other. The proposal would dominate my home and create an oppressive environment.

Noise and Disruption

It is obvious that any construction works will inevitably cause noise and disturbance. More importantly, the completed development may increase ongoing noise levels, affecting the peaceful character of the neighbourhood. In addition, given the extreme proximity of the suggested side extension to my property, the works would cause extreme disturbance to me.

Parking and Traffic Concerns

The proposal does not adequately address parking provision. The plans suggest four parking spaces at the front of the property, however the overall parking provision will drop, given that the proposed plans would have a two-storey side extension on the existing driveway. The scale of the proposed parking provision would only apply to four small to medium sized vehicles. Having lived next door to them for some time, this does not apply to the owners, and parking on the street is already something that occurs for the property. Increased vehicle use will add pressure to already limited on-street parking, create congestion and given the property's location on one of the steepest hills in the area, increases danger to pedestrians and other road users.

Streetscene

The character of Huddersfield's residential areas are valued for their balance of heritage and community feel. This proposal is out of keeping with the established character of the street and risks setting a precedent for inappropriate development. From the kerbside the proposed side extension is not remotely in keeping with similar developments in the area, which have seamlessly been incorporated into the existing structure. In addition, the plans show how from certain angles, almost nothing of the original property is visible.

Other issues

Detailed analysis

The Cadvis3D report states that a "detailed analysis of the constraints to development has been undertaken" yet there is no evidence of this analysis in the report. To merely cite this analysis does not seem adequate to form the basis of an application. In addition, such analysis would always be curated to support their client's viewpoint.

Sub-servant to the host dwelling

Such a vast overdevelopment of the existing site could not, in an impartial mind, be considered "sub-servant." Setting part of the building a few centimetres back, whilst building a plot more than twice the existing size of the existing property is not sub-servant.

Other dwellings in the area have erected similar two-storey extensions

This is untrue. Whilst other local properties have indeed built two-storey extensions, they have not built anything on the scale of this proposal, or extended on three sides of the existing property. To suggest that this comparable is misleading at best.

Scale

The report suggests that the size of the footprint is considered acceptable and suggests a number of reasons. First, this is opinion – not fact. It is the opinion of the report writer who is employed by the applicant. Repeatedly they use words such as considered, this shows it is a single viewpoint not a statement of fact. The reasons they suggest as to why it is acceptable include "the distance to the neighbouring boundaries," "the external topography" and "the position of the buildings in relation to each other." Given that the proposal would bring the property to one metre from the existing boundary, would be two stories high, would extend eight metres back from the existing property and is an elevated position compared to my property given the external topography of Bank End Lane, it is my considered

opinion that these aspects have been badly judged and are unacceptable. Indeed, one of the planning drawings submitted mentions that part of the plans are “narrow.” If this has already been identified why was no alteration made by the applicant? The report also says that the “host property and its associated curtilage is of a scale which would support the proposed extension without amounting to over-development or appearing incongruous.” Again this is opinion and a questionable one at that. As said, no other local property has extended so vastly, and on three sides. In addition, all other extensions have been incorporated into the existing design of the building, and do not look anything like the proposed street view of the application. Finally, the report states that “the proximity to neighbours is acceptable and the space created is proportionate to the site.” Acceptable to whom? Certainly not to me as the immediate neighbour, with the disproportionate size and extreme proximity of the proposal impacting me and my property more than anything or anyone else.

Amount of Development

The report suggests that “the amount of development in relation to the size of the plot and the surrounding properties should be acceptable.” Again this is an opinion. The plot size should not enter in this consideration, it should be the proposal to extend so vastly the existing footprint of the property in the proximity of its location in relation to neighbouring properties, and in particular mine.

Layout

The report states that the “layout has evolved through a comprehensive design approach.” It also refers to it being informed by “site constraints and characteristics and proximity to existing houses.” Again this opinion is questionable given all of the statements I have made in rebutting this application.

Appearance

The report states that the plans are to make the property “locally distinctive.” This is incongruous to it being in keeping with other local developments. No other local building has had such a huge, and unsightly development. It also says that it has a “strong emphasis on light.” This may be true for the applicant’s property, but most certainly is untrue for its impact on my home.

Conclusions

The report concludes that the “proposals are fully acceptable in design and access terms.” Again, I have to question to whom they are “fully acceptable” to, as the plans are wholly unacceptable to me, as the most impacted by them, and I would consider unacceptable to any impartial viewpoint.

For these reasons, I respectfully ask that Kirklees Council refuse this application. I urge the Council to protect the amenity of existing residents and preserve the character of our neighbourhood.

Yours faithfully,