

Ref Planning application 2026/90564 – Briar Mead

18 Vicarage Meadow
Mirfield
WF14 9JL

I would like to raise an objection to the above planning application.

The property in its current, newly extended condition, provides a significant amount of living space, easily adaptable to suit a variety of needs and layouts and being a bungalow is a very inclusive property.

Having just been extended to over 1700sq ft., described as having 3 spacious en-suite double bedrooms, the master bedroom over 17ft x 14ft, and an open plan living area of approximately 40ft x 19ft it already provides a significant living space, both adaptable and inclusive with scope to amend the layout to address a variety of requirements.

The planning application does not comply to the SDP adopted by KMCC at several points:

SDP Section 4.2 Key Design Principle 2 extensions should not ... be larger than the original house -

The bungalow was extended under approved conditional planning application 2024/92864, granted 12/12/2024, this extension took the bungalow to a size 80% bigger than before based on EPC data as below:

Prior to extension - EPC 05/04/2024 - 5 habitable rooms – 947 sq. ft (88sq. m) internal space

Post extension EPC 01/12/2025 – 6 habitable rooms – 1711sq. ft (159sq. m) internal space.

An increase of over 80%

If the garage is approved for demolition and the bungalow extended again (garage space currently stated as 273sq. ft., the new extension looks to be a significantly bigger footprint than the current garage by approx. 45%) the internal space will likely be extended to over 2100 sq. ft, over 120% bigger than the original dwelling and significantly larger than most family homes.

The bungalow prior to the previous planning application stood as a 3-bedroom, 1 bathroom, 2 reception rooms of a size more akin to a small 947sq. ft. retirement bungalow. This additional application will take the property to a large 4-bedroom, 4-

bathroom, 2 reception room family home of over 2100sq ft, this would significantly intensify any future domestic use of the dwelling.

By the architects own admission, on planning application 2024/93049, which includes a plan of the original semi-detached bungalow dated 1931, the current planning application (submitted by the same architects) will result in the final projection being some 12m beyond the original build line, of what would most likely have been a small 2-bedroom bungalow/cottage when first built.

SDP Section 4.25 – Sustainable Development – siting buildings and extensions to minimise overshadowing:

No actual measurement scale has been added to the drawings making it difficult to measure, but from the proposed drawings compared to the existing drawings, when overlaid on each other, the height of the eaves of the proposed extension compared to the existing garage height, is over double. This will significantly overshadow the main east facing living space which has a large glazing element. On the plans for the extension there are also floor to ceiling north facing windows included in rooms which already have a significant glazing element to other elevations. From the plans it looks likely that this has been designed to allow a door at some future point.

As the original flat roof garage sits at single storey height somewhat lower and set back than the original bungalow, any side extension will not look like a natural part and will be an obvious add on.

SDP Section 4.43 and 5.51 the extension will result in no external access to the rear garden.

SDP Section 4.46 Access to the proposed extended area will not be disabled access as it has no external access and internally can only be accessed by steps and therefore will not address the NPPF as stated to support the needs of people with disabilities any more than the current bungalow can.

SDP Section 5.6 – Single storey extensions should ... not exceed 4m in height, not project more than 3m from the rear wall of the original house for a semi detached ...where they exceed 3m in length the eaves height should not generally exceed 2.5m and retain a gap of at least 1m from the property boundary.

The proposed development exceeds all the above measurements.

In addition to the above, the bungalow is accessed via a single width, unmade, private drive shared with 7 other dwellings, two of which neighbour the property are bungalows and there is little or no areas for turning for visitors or deliveries.

It should also be noted that the dates on the drawings of the current application are somewhat confusing. The house was purchased in September 2024 by Mirfield Construction, a planning application (2024/92490, submitted 3/9/24) was refused. A new application 2024/92864 for a Mr & Mrs Brooke to extend was then granted 12/12/24, with work beginning almost immediately and taking approximately 12 months to complete. The property was then offered to the open market with Wilcox on 2/12/25 and listed as sold STC in a matter of weeks.

The current application (to which the objection is raised), submitted by the same architects, but now for a Mr & Mrs Gordon, shows plans which are dated 26/01/25, this is approx. 6 weeks after the first planning was approved and almost 11 months prior to the property being listed on the open market. This could just be a typing error.

Also, on the application at Part B, Certificate of Ownership, it states that "all other owners as listed" and yet it does not list the current owners of the property, Mirfield Construction, anywhere on the application, even though Orange Design Studio also submitted the prior application on behalf of Mirfield Construction. Mr & Mrs Gordon, according to Land Registry documents as of 16th March 2026, do not own the property and yet nowhere on the application is this highlighted to the planning office.

In conclusion the application to extend an already overly extended bungalow does not appear justified given that the bungalow already provides a highly inclusive and adaptable living space of over 1700 sq. ft. If the only option to any applicant/potential purchaser is to extend an already overly extended bungalow, then it could be suggested that the property is not suitable for the needs required.