

Address: 58, Wharf Street, Dewsbury, WF12 9AU

About the application

Application number: 2026/91233	
What is the application for?:	Erection of detached dwelling
Address of the site or building:	50, Orchard Street, Savile Town, Dewsbury, WF12 9LH
Postcode:	WF12 9LH

User comments

Type of comment: An objection	
Do you wish your comments to be published on the website anonymously?	No
<p>I wish to formally object to the above planning application.</p> <p>My objection is based on material planning considerations, including the scale and intensity of the proposed development, its impact on neighbouring residential amenity, privacy, outlook, light, the character of the street scene, ecology, and the lack of sufficient supporting information to demonstrate that the proposal can be accommodated safely and appropriately on this constrained site.</p> <p>1. Overdevelopment of a constrained corner plot</p> <p>The application proposes a substantial detached dwelling on a relatively constrained and irregular corner plot at the junction of Orchard Street and Cross Street. The proposed dwelling is not a modest infill development. It is a large, multi-level family dwelling with accommodation over lower ground, ground, first and second-floor levels.</p> <p>In my view, the scale, height, massing and intensity of the proposed dwelling would amount to overdevelopment of the site. The proposal would introduce a much more dominant built form onto a currently open corner plot and would significantly alter the sense of openness at this part of Orchard Street/Cross Street.</p> <p>The surrounding area is characterised by established residential properties, and the proposed dwelling would appear cramped and overly dominant within the plot. The development would not sit comfortably within the existing street scene and would create an unacceptable sense of enclosure for neighbouring residents.</p> <p>2. Harm to residential amenity, outlook and sense of enclosure</p> <p>The proposed development would have a direct and harmful impact on neighbouring occupiers, particularly those properties facing or adjoining the site.</p> <p>The proposed building would introduce a sizeable structure where there is currently open space. Due to its height, bulk and position, the development would have an</p>	

open space. Due to its height, bulk and position, the development would have an overbearing effect when viewed from nearby homes. This is particularly concerning for properties opposite and adjacent to the site, whose principal windows and habitable rooms face towards the proposed development.

Kirklees' own residential design guidance recognises the importance of maintaining adequate privacy, outlook and natural light for neighbouring residents. This proposal fails to convincingly demonstrate that those standards would be protected.

The applicant has not provided a clear daylight/sunlight assessment or a sufficient residential amenity assessment showing that existing neighbouring homes would not suffer unacceptable harm. Without that evidence, the Council cannot safely conclude that the proposal would avoid harm to nearby residents.

3. Loss of privacy and overlooking

The proposed dwelling includes upper-floor windows serving habitable rooms. Given the position of the plot and its relationship with nearby homes, there is a real risk of direct overlooking into neighbouring properties.

The issue is not simply that a new house would be visible. The concern is that the proposed upper-floor accommodation would materially change the existing privacy relationship between homes. Existing residents currently benefit from a more open outlook across the site. The proposed dwelling would create new elevated viewpoints from first and second-floor windows, increasing the risk of overlooking into bedrooms, living areas and private domestic spaces.

The Council's guidance refers to recommended separation distances between habitable room windows and the need to avoid harmful overlooking. The application does not clearly demonstrate that these standards are met, nor does it provide adequate mitigation such as repositioned windows, obscure glazing where appropriate, or a revised layout to reduce overlooking.

4. Loss of light and overshadowing

The proposed dwelling would be materially higher and more substantial than the existing open condition of the site. This raises clear concerns about loss of daylight and overshadowing to nearby properties, particularly those directly facing or immediately adjacent to the application site.

The submitted information does not appear to include a proper daylight/sunlight assessment. This is a significant omission given the scale and position of the proposed dwelling and the close relationship with neighbouring residential properties.

The Council should not approve the application unless it is fully satisfied, with evidence, that neighbouring habitable rooms and private amenity areas would not suffer unacceptable loss of natural light.

5. Harm to the character and appearance of the area

The proposed dwelling would occupy a prominent corner position at Orchard Street and Cross Street. Because of this, the development would be highly visible within the street scene.

The current open corner provides visual relief in an otherwise built-up residential area. The proposed dwelling would remove that openness and replace it with a large, dominant structure. The result would be a more cramped and enclosed appearance, which would be harmful to the character and appearance of the immediate area.

The proposal does not appear to respond sufficiently to the existing pattern of development, spacing, scale, or the character of surrounding properties. A development of this size on this plot would appear forced rather than naturally integrated into the street scene.

6. Ecology and loss of trees/greenery

The site contains trees, scrub and other vegetation which currently contribute to the visual character of the area and may provide habitat for wildlife.

The Council's Ecology Team has indicated that the site includes features such as mature trees and a stone wall, and that a Preliminary Ecological Appraisal is required prior to decision to assess habitats and the potential presence of protected or priority species.

That is a serious issue. The application should not be determined until the required ecological assessment has been provided and properly considered. It would be premature to grant permission before the Council fully und