

Search application details

Application number: 2025/62/93480/W	
What is the application for?:	Erection of 28 dwellings with associated landscaping and external works
Address of the site or building:	Land off Parkwood Road/Weavers Lane, Longwood, Huddersfield, HD3 4TT
Postcode:	

User comments

Type of comment: An objection	
Do you wish your comments to be published on the website anonymously?	Yes
Formal Planning Objection	
Planning Application: 2025/62/93480/W Site: Proposed Residential Development	
Dear Planning Officer,	
I write to submit a formal objection to the above planning application.	
I wish to make clear that I am not opposed to residential development on this site in principle. My objection relates specifically to the siting and massing of Plots 26 and 27, which, unlike the remainder of the proposed dwellings, are positioned immediately against the boundary of my property	
This unusual and intensified arrangement results in unacceptable harm to residential amenity and conflicts with both national and local planning policy.	
1. Harm to Residential Amenity	
(National Planning Policy Framework – Paragraph 130)	
Paragraph 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) requires development to ensure a high standard of amenity for existing and future occupants.	
Plots 26 and 27 breach this principle. All other proposed dwellings on the site maintain reasonable separation distances from existing properties; only these two plots are positioned directly against my boundary with minimal setback. This results in a disproportionate and inequitable impact that is not experienced by any other neighbouring property.	

2. Overbearing Impact and Loss of Outlook

Due to their height, two-storey form, and immediate proximity, Plots 26 and 27 would create an overbearing built form along my boundary, resulting in:

a dominant and enclosing impact;

a significant loss of outlook from rear-facing habitable rooms; and

material harm to the enjoyment of my private rear garden.

This level of impact is unique and is not justified by the wider site layout.

3. Loss of Daylight and Sunlight

(BRE 209 – Site Layout Planning for Daylight and Sunlight)

The proximity and massing of Plots 26 and 27 raise serious concerns regarding daylight, sunlight and overshadowing. In particular:

the reduced separation distance compared to the rest of the site is likely to reduce daylight to rear rooms

the height and siting of the dwellings risk overshadowing my private garden during periods when it currently receives sunlight.

In accordance with BRE 209 guidance, I request that the Local Planning Authority require a full daylight and sunlight assessment, including overshadowing analysis prior to determination. Without such evidence, the impacts cannot be properly assessed.

4. Loss of Privacy and Overlooking

Depending on the final positioning of windows and ground levels, Plots 26 and 27 pose a risk of overlooking into my private rear garden and potentially into habitable rooms.

Indicative separation distances commonly applied within Local Plans appear not to be met. I request that the LPA require revised siting, reorientation, or appropriate window design (including obscure glazing where necessary) to ensure privacy is adequately protected.

5. Poor Design and Inconsistency With Site Layout

(NPPF Paragraph 134)

Paragraph 134 of the NPPF states that development which represents poor design or fails to improve the quality of an area should be refused.

The placement of Plots 26 and 27 directly against my boundary, when all other plots

benefit from generous spacing, represents poor and inconsistent design. It places an unreasonable burden on a single neighbouring property and fails to achieve a balanced or equitable layout.

6. Health, Disability and Equality Considerations

(Equality Act 2010 – Public Sector Equality Duty)

I am a disabled resident with long-term health conditions, and my ability to enjoy and make effective use of my home is particularly sensitive to loss of light, outlook and increased enclosure.

In addition, my son, who has Down's syndrome, visits me regularly. Any significant reduction in natural light, increased enclosure, or loss of outlook would adversely affect his wellbeing and cause distress.

Under Section 149 of the Equality Act 2010, the Council is required to have due regard to the potential impacts of its decisions on disabled people. While personal circumstances do not override planning policy, they are a relevant consideration when assessing residential amenity impacts and reinforce the need for careful, equitable site layout.

7. Reasonable and Practical Alternatives Exist

The harm caused by the siting of Plots 26 and 27 is entirely avoidable. The wider site layout demonstrates that the developer could:

reposition the plots further into the site;

adjust their footprint or orientation;

introduce a greater boundary buffer; or

reduce height or massing where necessary.

These are proportionate design changes that would avoid significant harm without reducing housing delivery.

Summary and Requested Action

In summary, the current proposal would result in:

unacceptable overbearing impact;

loss of daylight and sunlight;

loss of outlook;

potential overlooking and loss of privacy;

poor and inconsistent design; and

avoidable harm to a disabled resident and visiting disabled family member.

I respectfully request that the Local Planning Authority:

Require a revised layout repositioning Plots 26 and 27 away from my boundary;

Seek a BRE-compliant daylight and sunlight assessment

Secure appropriate privacy-protecting design amendments; and

Refuse the application in its current form if these issues cannot be adequately addressed.

I remain supportive of well-designed development on this site, but the current siting of Plots 26 and 27 causes unnecessary and avoidable harm to my home.

Yours faithfully,