

DC Admin

From:
Sent: 11 May 2026 19:35
To: DC Admin
Cc:
Subject: FW: Re. PLANNING OBJECTION - Planning Application Reference: 2026/62/90902/E

CAUTION: External email. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

PLANNING OBJECTION

Date: 10 May 2026

Application Reference: 2026/62/90902/E

To Kirklees Planning Department,

Following the erection of the site notice, I wish to formally object to this application.

Fundamental Harm to Character and Symmetry

A comparison of the submitted Existing Elevations (EX/2) and Proposed Elevations (EX/4) clearly demonstrates that the property currently forms part of a continuous pitched roof structure, contributing to a coherent and symmetrical architectural form.

The proposal involves removing part of this unified roof and replacing it with a flat roof extension. This would introduce a clear and abrupt visual break, resulting in a discordant and unbalanced form of development.

The proposed elevations themselves clearly illustrate this harmful break in the roofline.

This is fundamentally at odds with the established character of the building and conflicts with Kirklees design guidance, which requires development to respond positively to local context and neighbouring properties.

Out of Keeping with the Established Street Scene

No other property within the street has undertaken a comparable alteration.

- The area exhibits a consistent pitched roof form and architectural rhythm
- The proposal introduces a visually prominent and inconsistent feature
- The alteration would erode the uniformity and cohesion of the street

This reinforces that the proposal is not reflective of the character of the locality.

Poor Design and Lack of Integration

The proposed flat roof form fails to integrate with the host property:

- It conflicts with the original roof design
- It appears as a bolt-on, visually disconnected element
- It does not respect the form or proportions of the original building

This represents poor design quality and conflicts with principles requiring extensions to enhance rather than detract from existing buildings.

Inadequate Detail and Failure to Demonstrate Boundary Relationship

The proposed drawings fail to adequately demonstrate:

- the precise position of the boundary
- how the new structure interfaces with the adjoining property
- how the roof alteration is formed at the junction with the neighbouring dwelling

In particular, the plans do not show:

- how the flat roof meets the retained pitched roof
- whether elements extend beyond the boundary
- whether structural or weatherproofing elements affect the adjoining property

This lack of clarity means the Local Planning Authority cannot properly assess the proposal, including its impact on neighbouring amenity and design quality.

I formally dispute the boundary as shown on the submitted plans and do not accept that it accurately reflects the legal boundary.

Impact on Residential Amenity

The proposal would adversely affect neighbouring amenity through:

- an overbearing impact due to its proximity and mass
- a more dominant and intrusive form compared to a sloping roof
- potential for overlooking or perceived overlooking from the flat roof form

These impacts are recognised material planning considerations that must be given weight.

Shared Structure and Deliverability Concerns

The existing elevations strongly suggest a continuous and potentially interdependent roof structure.

The application does not demonstrate:

- that the roof structures are independent
- how structural stability will be maintained
- how weatherproofing will be achieved without affecting the adjoining property

The proposal therefore appears to rely on assumptions regarding shared structure and neighbouring property, raising serious doubts about whether it can be implemented as shown.

Boundary Dispute, Ownership and Legal Constraints

Planning permission does not override property rights and does not grant permission to:

- build on neighbouring land
- construct over or under neighbouring land
- install elements into neighbouring airspace
- attach to neighbouring structures without consent

I formally state:

“I dispute the boundary shown on the submitted plans. The proposed development encroaches onto, or relies upon, land within my ownership.”

This raises concerns regarding the accuracy of the ownership certificate and whether the application has been properly validated.

While matters such as trespass and the Party Wall etc. Act 1996 are civil in nature, the proposal clearly relies on works affecting a shared structure and boundary, which is relevant to the feasibility and assessment of the application.

Risk of Harmful Precedent

Given that no similar alterations exist within the street:

- Approval would represent a clear departure from the established pattern
- It would encourage similar unsympathetic changes
- This would result in cumulative harm to the character of the area

My overall Conclusion

The proposal:

- fundamentally disrupts a continuous roof form
- introduces poor and incongruous design
- fails to respect the character of the area
- lacks sufficient detail to allow proper assessment
- raises serious concerns regarding boundary accuracy and feasibility

I respectfully request that this application be **refused**.

Yours faithfully,

34 Pyenot Hall Lane
Cleckheaton
BD19 5AZ