

Nicole Helliwell
Planning Policy Group
PO Box 1720
Huddersfield
HD1 9EL

2, Reservoir Street
Dewsbury
WF13 4NQ

5th January 2026

Application No: 2025/62/93313/E

Address: 68, Oxford Road, Dewsbury, WF13 4EH

Dear Nicole,

I wish to object to the above application. My property at 2 Reservoir Street lies directly to the rear of the application site and would be directly affected by the proposed development. This property has already been substantially extended in 2009/2010 to almost double its original size which was initially built as a bungalow.

1. Overdevelopment and Lack of Subservience

Rebuttal to Planning Statement paragraphs 3.1, 6.1–6.6, 6.29

The Planning Statement acknowledges that the proposed extensions are “large” but concludes they are acceptable due to plot size. This approach fails to assess the cumulative impact of:

- A two-storey rear extension
- A single-storey rear extension
- Multiple balconies
- Increased height and bulk across the full rear elevation

Policy LP24(c) and the House Extensions SPD (Principle 2) require extensions to remain clearly subordinate to the host dwelling. The proposal would significantly alter the scale and mass of the original house to such an extent that it effectively creates a new, much larger dwelling, contrary to adopted guidance.

Plot size alone does not justify excessive enlargement.

2. Loss of Privacy from Rear-Facing Balconies

Rebuttal to paragraphs 6.15–6.16

Paragraph 6.15 of the Planning Statement states that views from the balconies would be limited and primarily toward the applicant’s own garden. This is incorrect.

The balconies are elevated and rear-facing, and my property at 2 Reservoir Street sits directly behind the site, meaning the proposals would enable direct overlooking into private rear garden space.

This would result in a material loss of privacy, contrary to:

- Local Plan Policy LP24
- NPPF (2024) Paragraph 135(f)

No meaningful mitigation (such as obscure screening or balcony redesign) is proposed, and reliance on existing trees is unreliable given seasonal changes.

3. Overbearing Impact and Sense of Enclosure

Rebuttal to paragraphs 6.12–6.14

The Planning Statement concludes that the extensions would not be overbearing due to retained distances and roof design. However, this underestimates the impact of the combined height, depth and mass of the rear extensions when viewed from Reservoir Street.

The cumulative built form would create a dominant rear elevation, resulting in a sense of enclosure and loss of outlook from neighbouring properties, including No. 2 Reservoir Street.

This conflicts with:

- House Extensions SPD (Principle 1)
- Local Plan Policy LP24(a)

Distance alone does not remove the perception of dominance, particularly in rear garden contexts.

4. Misuse of the 45-Degree Rule

Rebuttal to paragraph 6.13 and diagrams

The Planning Statement relies heavily on the 45-degree rule to justify acceptability. This is misleading.

The 45-degree rule is guidance only and does not assess:

- Overlooking from balconies
- Overbearing impact
- Loss of privacy
- Cumulative scale of development

Planning decisions must be based on overall amenity impact, not a single diagrammatic test. Over-reliance on this method results in an incomplete assessment.

5. Character and Rear Garden Context

Rebuttal to paragraphs 6.26–6.32

While front elevations may be visible from Oxford Road, the proposal fails to adequately consider the rear garden character when viewed from Reservoir Street.

The introduction of:

- Elevated balconies
- Extensive rear extensions
- Increased building mass

This is out of keeping with the established rear garden environment and would erode the residential character of the area, contrary to LP24(a) and NPPF Paragraph 135(c).

6. Weight Given to Non-Material Considerations

Rebuttal to paragraphs 1.1–1.5 and 6.4

Significant emphasis is placed on the applicant's personal circumstances, investment intentions, and design aspirations. These are not material planning considerations and cannot outweigh harm to neighbouring residential amenity.

7. Conclusion

The proposal would result in:

- Overdevelopment of the site
- Loss of privacy to 2 Reservoir Street
- Overbearing impact from excessive rear massing
- Conflict with Local Plan Policy LP24, the House Extensions SPD, and NPPF Paragraph 135

For these reasons, the application should be refused, or substantially redesigned, including the removal of rear-facing balconies and a reduction in rear extension scale.

I would be grateful if you can take into consideration all of the above reasons for our appeal against this extension. A copy of this letter has also been emailed to nicole.helliwell@kirklees.gov.uk.

Yours sincerely,