

Address: 9, Milford Grove, Bradford, Bd19 4Bb

About the application

Application number: 2026/90909	
What is the application for?:	Erection of single storey front and two storey rear extensions
Address of the site or building:	7, Milford Grove, Birkenshaw, BD19 4BB
Postcode:	BD19 4BB

User comments

Type of comment: An objection	
Do you wish your comments to be published on the website anonymously?	No
I wish to formally object to planning application 2026/62/90909/E for a two-storey extension at 7, Milford Grove, Birkenshaw, BD19 4BB. I live in the neighbouring property (9 Milford Grove) and my objections are set out below: 1. Loss of Light and Overshadowing The proposed scale, height, and siting of the extension would result in a loss of daylight and sunlight to my property, shadowing the rear garden and conservatory during the morning period. The extension has not been designed with any consideration to the impact on my property. This is clear from the plans which fail to show the location of my conservatory adjacent to the extension. Without this detail, the Council cannot properly consider the impacts of the development. 2. Overbearing Impact The extension would appear dominant and overbearing due to its massing and scale. Currently, all the neighbouring properties sit on a similar line to the rear with only single storey extensions on a few houses. The two-storey extension would project outwards beyond this building line which when viewed from my property would appear overbearing creating a sense of enclosure. 3. Harm to Residential Amenity (Conservatory) The proposed extension would have a severe impact on my conservatory. Its scale and positioning would significantly reduce incoming natural light and introduce an overbearing presence, undermining the use of this space as a functional and enjoyable living area. 4. Impact on Family Life and Wellbeing The matters I have discussed above (loss of light, overshadowing, and overbearing) need to be considered in the context of the impact it would have on our amenity and particularly my family's wellbeing. The development would have a serious effect on our family's living conditions. This is very important to us given that we have Our rear garden and conservatory are essential environments that serve as calm, structured, and familiar spaces. Both love being outdoors in all weather. The conservatory is his own space in the house. Effectively, both the garden and conservatory act as a "safe haven"	

Effectively, both the garden and conservatory act as a safe haven

The introduction of this dominant feature would severely impact their (and our) enjoyment of our private space.

Kirklees Local Plan policies, including Policy D4 (Design) and Policy D1 (Place Making), require development to protect the amenity of neighbouring occupiers and to create healthy, inclusive environments. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) also stresses the importance of securing a high standard of amenity for existing and future occupants. The proposed development would materially harm our residential amenity by significantly degrading spaces that are critically important to the health and wellbeing through the reduction of light, openness, and environmental quality.

5. Compliance with the Kirklees House Extensions Supplementary Planning Document
The plans show no annotation of measurements for the height of the extension or distance from the boundary lines. However, I would make the following comments. The SPD states that rear extensions should preserve a back garden of reasonable size and follows a general principle that at least half of the garden is retained. It is difficult to calculate from the plans the exact amount of rear garden area left after the development however, for the plot size, the scale of the proposed extension appears excessive.

The SPD states that an extension should not exceed the height of the eaves by more than 3 metres and should be separated from the property boundary by at least 1.5 metres. It is not clear whether the proposal is compliant with this guidance. Even if it can be confirmed that the proposal is compliant, the above objection are a result of the height and massing of the proposal which is not policy compliant as a result of the impacts on my property.

7. Conflict with Local Planning Policy

Overall, the proposal conflicts with planning policies, including:

- Policy LP4 (Design) – requiring development to respect neighbouring amenity and ensuring that extensions are subservient to the original building
 - NPPF (Section 12) – achieving well-designed places and a high standard of amenity
- The development fails to meet these requirements due to its harmful impact on light, outlook, and residential amenity.

8. Alternative Proposals

Firstly, I would point out that the applicants have made no attempt to engage with us prior to the submission of the application. Had they done so, I would have pointed out my concerns at the design stage.

Subject to seeing designs, I would not have any objections to a single storey extension. I believe it is the two-storey element of the development which causes the impacts I have raised above.

Conclusion

For the reasons set out above, I request that planning permission is refused.