

About the application

Application number: 2026/90136	
What is the application for?:	Erection of first floor side extension (within a Conservation Area)
Address of the site or building:	153, West End, Netherthong, Holmfirth, HD9 3EJ
Postcode:	

User comments

Type of comment: An objection	
Do you wish your comments to be published on the website anonymously?	Yes
Thank you for the chance to follow up on my previous comments. I write again to strongly object to the above planning application based on the following material planning considerations: 1. Failure to Meet Design Standards and Loss of Symmetry (Policy LP24) While the applicant claims the design seeks to "preserve symmetry", the proposal results in a complete loss of any remaining architectural balance. By adding a first-floor extension of this scale, the original proportions of the dwelling are compromised. Under Kirklees Local Plan Policy LP24(a) and the House Extensions SPD, alterations must respect the form and character of the host building. This proposal creates an unbalanced, top-heavy appearance that is over-dominant and fails to remain a "subordinate" element. 2. Harm to the Setting of the Grade II Listed All Saints' Church (Policy LP35) Under Policy LP35, development must "preserve or enhance" the heritage significance of designated assets and their settings. The supporter's comments regarding "previous works" refer to a single-storey extension that is largely screened from the adjacent Grade II Listed All Saints' Church. However, this new first-floor extension will be completely visible from the churchyard. This increased height and massing will have a detrimental impact on the setting of the listed building, causing a level of visual harm that was not present with the previous single-storey works. The council has a statutory duty to protect this setting. 3. Loss of Privacy, the "Balcony Effect," and Overshadowing (Policy LP24 & SPD) The applicant's assertion that the design avoids harm to neighbouring amenity is fundamentally incorrect. Under Policy LP24(b), development must provide a high standard of amenity for existing residents: • Loss of Privacy: I specifically object to the first-floor balconies, which create a detrimental "balcony effect." These provide a permanent, elevated platform encouraging direct, unobstructed overlooking into mine and surrounding private gardens & residencies. The House Extensions SPD is clear that extensions should not result in a significant loss of privacy. • Overshadowing: Reviewing drawing (100) 05 North West Elevation, the proposed extension will clearly overshadow property 153a. This massing violates Key Design Principle 5 of the Kirklees House Extensions SPD, which states that extensions will not	

Principle 5 of the Kirklees House Extensions SPD, which states that extensions will not be permitted if they unreasonably overshadow neighbouring properties. I urge the case officer to apply the 45-degree rule to this elevation, as the drawing indicates a material loss of natural light presently enjoyed by the occupants of 153a.

4. Weight of Supportive Representations and Previous Non-Compliance

I note that the supportive comments submitted are from individuals who do not live in the immediate area. As they do not experience the daily practical impacts on local highway safety or residential amenity, their views should be afforded limited weight compared to those of immediate neighbours. Furthermore, the applicant's reference to "previous works" is misleading; I wish to highlight that previous developments on this site have either differed from the planning approvals given, for example the installation of a substantial metallic chimney, or had no approval granted. This history of non-compliance should be a material factor in considering the current proposal.

5. Highway Safety and Shared Access (Policy LP21)

The applicant minimizes the impact on the shared access. However, Policy LP21 requires that development does not have a detrimental impact on highway safety. By increasing the internal capacity of the dwelling, the proposal inherently increases parking demand. If the property cannot provide the required off-street parking spaces within its own curtilage as per Kirklees standards.

The proposal represents an overdevelopment of the site that is contrary to the Kirklees Local Plan and the House Extensions SPD. I respectfully request that the Planning Officer conducts a site visit to view the impact from the neighbouring properties and the churchyard, and ultimately refuses the application.