

About the application

Application number: 2026/92636	
What is the application for?:	Demolition of existing garage and erection of two storey and single storey side
Address of the site or building:	42, York Avenue, Fartown, Huddersfield, HD2 2QT
Postcode:	HD2 2QT

User comments

Type of comment: An objection	
Do you wish your comments to be published on the website anonymously?	Yes
OBJECTION TO PLANNING APPLICATION Planning application: 2026/62/92636/W Property: 42 York Avenue, Fartown, Huddersfield, HD2 2QT Grounds for objection I wish to formally object to the above planning application for the demolition of the existing garage and erection of two-storey and single-storey extensions at 42 York Avenue, Huddersfield. My objection relates primarily to the proposed development's impact on access to the rear of the property, the failure to retain adequate space alongside the building, and the size and projection of the proposed two-storey rear extension. I am not opposed to the principle of my neighbour extending their property. However, I have concerns that the proposed design does not adequately consider the practical requirements of the property or the guidance contained within the Kirklees House Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document (SPD). Loss of access to the rear of the property The proposed development appears to remove external access to the rear garden by building too close to the side boundary. This raises concerns about how the rear of the property will be accessed and maintained in the future. The Kirklees House Extensions and Alterations SPD, section 5.1, identifies the need to consider maintaining external access to the rear garden when designing rear extensions. The absence of a suitable access route would create practical difficulties for the	

The absence of a suitable access route would create practical difficulties for the occupants, including moving garden equipment, maintaining the garden, and carrying out future repairs and maintenance. It could also create difficulties during construction and limit access for necessary works in the future.

I believe the design should be amended to retain a suitable external access route to the rear garden.

Failure to retain the recommended one-metre side access

Section 5.19 of the Kirklees House Extensions and Alterations SPD highlights the importance of retaining adequate space between buildings to preserve the character and sense of space within the area.

Furthermore, section 5.20 states that two-storey side extensions should maintain a one-metre gap to the side boundary to ensure that the building is not too close to a neighbouring property.

The current proposal does not appear to retain this recommended one-metre gap. Building up to, or extremely close to, the boundary would remove the space needed for access and could create avoidable practical difficulties for both the occupants and future maintenance.

I therefore believe the proposal should be revised to retain a minimum one-metre access path alongside the property, in accordance with the relevant design guidance.

Size and projection of the two-storey rear extension

I am also concerned about the scale of the proposed two-storey rear extension, which is shown to project approximately three metres beyond the existing rear wall of the property.

The proposed projection would create a substantial additional built form at the rear of the house. I believe the council should carefully assess whether this scale of development is appropriate in relation to the original dwelling, the neighbouring properties and the surrounding residential environment.

Section 5.4 of the Kirklees House Extensions and Alterations SPD states that the size and projection of rear extensions need to be strictly controlled to avoid problems associated with loss of light, privacy and outlook.

Although I recognise that the proposed extension does not include an upstairs window directly overlooking my garden, I remain concerned about the overall bulk of the development and its effect on the outlook from my property.

I ask the council to consider whether the three-metre projection of the two-storey element is necessary and whether a reduced projection could achieve the applicant's objectives while resulting in a more appropriate development. Compliance with planning policy and design guidance.

Policy LP24 of the Kirklees Local Plan requires extensions to be appropriately designed, proportionate to the original building and respectful of the residential amenity of neighbouring occupiers.

In my view, the combination of the proposed two-storey rear projection and the lack of adequate side access raises concerns about whether the development has been designed to make appropriate use of the site while respecting these principles.

I ask the planning officer to assess the application against the relevant provisions of the Kirklees Local Plan and the House Extensions and Alterations SPD, particularly the guidance concerning external rear access, separation from boundaries, and the scale and projection of rear extensions.

Conclusion and requested amendments

For the reasons outlined above, I respectfully request that the council reconsider the proposal in its current form.

I believe the development could be made more acceptable through the following amendments:

- Retain a minimum one-metre access path alongside the property to provide external access to the rear garden.
- Reduce the scale or projection of the two-storey rear extension, currently proposed to extend approximately three metres beyond the existing rear wall.
- Ensure the revised design complies with the relevant Kirklees planning policies and supplementary design guidance.

I ask that these concerns are fully considered before a decision is made on the application. I would prefer the proposal to be amended to address these issues rather than approved in its current form.

Yours faithfully,