Subject: Planning Application 2026/91657
Objection to Proposed Double Garage at Plot 23

I wish to object to the proposed double garage at Plot 23 shown within planning application 2026/91657.

My objection relates to the proposal's impact upon the scale, bulk, massing and extent of development on Plot 23, together with the apparent inconsistency with the Local Planning Authority's previous assessment of the same proposal. I also respectfully request that the Authority independently verifies the as-built levels of Plot 23 and the resulting driveway gradient before determining this application.

Scale, Bulk and Massing

The supporting Planning Statement places considerable emphasis on the appearance of the garage frontage, explaining that the proposed double garage has been designed with two single garage doors separated by a stone column in order to avoid the appearance of one large garage door.

Whilst this alters the appearance of the frontage, it does not reduce the physical scale of the garage itself.

The proposal remains a substantial attached double garage measuring approximately 6.81 metres by 7.13 metres externally, providing an external footprint of approximately 48.6 square metres. Internally, the garage measures approximately 6.44 metres by 6.38 metres, providing approximately 41 square metres of usable floor area.

The central stone pier is simply an architectural treatment. It does not reduce the garage's width, roof span, roof area, bulk or overall built volume. The planning impact therefore arises from the physical enlargement of the building rather than the appearance of the garage doors.

The proposal materially increases:

- the footprint of the dwelling;
- the amount of built development on Plot 23;
- the width of the attached garage;
- the roof span and roof area associated with the garage;
- the overall bulk and massing of the dwelling; and
- its visual prominence within the street scene.

These are all material planning considerations and should be assessed cumulatively rather than considering the appearance of the garage frontage in isolation.

The garage also ceases to appear as a subordinate ancillary element of the dwelling. Instead, it becomes a major architectural component of the western elevation beneath a substantial pitched roof, materially increasing the apparent scale and dominance of the building.

This increased bulk is particularly significant because Plot 23 directly faces No. 92. As presently proposed, the garage roof would stand higher than the single-storey element , contributing to a greater sense of enclosure, visual dominance and overall scale when viewed

Relationship Between the Garage and Lower-Ground Accommodation

The proposal should not be viewed simply as the provision of additional covered parking.

The garage forms part of a vertically integrated building comprising lower-ground accommodation beneath, the garage above, the principal accommodation beyond and the roof structure above. The garage therefore contributes directly to the overall scale, built volume and massing of the dwelling as a whole.

I also note that the room beneath the proposed garage was originally shown as a dining room, with the kitchen located within the substantially larger adjoining room.

Within the current application, the room beneath the garage is now identified as the kitchen.

This change raises a legitimate planning question. A kitchen would ordinarily be expected to require more floor area than a dining room. The revised layout therefore appears to suggest that the enlarged footprint created by the proposed double garage is necessary to accommodate the kitchen below.

If that is intended to form part of the planning justification for the enlarged garage, I respectfully suggest that the Authority should examine this carefully.

The permanent planning consequences are the increased footprint, roof area, built volume and massing created by the enlarged garage. By contrast, the internal use of domestic rooms may subsequently be rearranged without necessarily requiring further planning permission.

Accordingly, the Local Planning Authority should assess whether the proposed double garage is acceptable on its own planning merits, rather than attaching significant weight to the present designation of the room beneath it.

If the enlarged garage is considered acceptable because the kitchen is shown beneath it, I respectfully ask what planning mechanism would prevent the kitchen subsequently reverting to its previous location within the larger adjoining room, leaving the enlarged garage and its associated massing permanently in place.

Previous Planning Assessment

I am also concerned that the proposal reintroduces a form of development which the Council has previously regarded as problematic.

During consideration of application 2024/91236, the Local Planning Authority's own internal assessment identified the proposed double garage as giving rise to concerns regarding overdevelopment. The approved scheme was subsequently amended to a single garage.

The current application therefore seeks to reintroduce the very feature that previously generated concern.

The Planning Statement does not explain what material planning circumstances have changed since that earlier assessment.

If the Local Planning Authority is now minded to reach a different planning judgement, I respectfully request that the officer's report clearly identifies the material planning reasons which justify departing from the Authority's previous professional assessment.

Comparable As-Built Level Discrepancy

I also respectfully request that the Local Planning Authority independently verifies the existing levels of Plot 23 before determining this application.

Comparable dwellings elsewhere within the development incorporate garages constructed above lower-ground accommodation using the same fundamental design approach proposed for Plot 23.

In particular, the approved drawings for Plot 2 show the garage door threshold and the principal entrance threshold at the same level. However, the completed dwelling appears not to accord with that relationship: the garage threshold appears to be approximately four stone courses, or in the region of 430 mm, above the entrance threshold. The same apparent feature can be seen on other comparable dwellings on the site.

The approximate 430 mm figure is an estimate derived from the visible masonry courses and the proportion of the front-door height shown in photographs; it is not presented as a surveyed measurement. Nevertheless, the approved plan and the completed built form together identify a clear and material discrepancy that requires investigation.

This is directly relevant to Plot 23. If a similar threshold discrepancy occurred there, the garage would not merely be approached at a higher level: unless the superstructure above were correspondingly reduced, the garage eaves and ridge would also be materially higher than shown on the submitted elevations. That would intensify the already substantial garage’s bulk, dominance and relationship with the single-storey side of No. 92.

Driveway Gradient, Access and Parking Functionality

The submitted plans indicate that the driveway is approximately 8.15 metres long, with a stated level of 201.50 metres at its entrance and a proposed garage-threshold level of 201.05 metres.

On the submitted levels, the driveway would therefore fall approximately 450 mm towards the garage, equivalent to an average gradient of approximately 5.5%, or 1 in 18.1.

However, my site measurements indicate that the constructed ground-floor level of Plot 23 may already be approximately 820 mm higher than the level shown on the current application drawings.

If the proposed garage threshold follows that raised ground-floor datum, it would be approximately 201.87 metres. Against the stated driveway-entrance level of 201.50 metres, the driveway would no longer fall 450 mm towards the garage; it would instead need to rise approximately 370 mm over 8.15 metres, equivalent to an average gradient of approximately 4.5%, or 1 in 22.

There is a further risk demonstrated by Plot 2 and other comparable dwellings. Their approved plans show the garage-door threshold and principal entrance threshold at the same level, yet the completed garage thresholds appear to be approximately four masonry courses - estimated at around 430 mm - above the associated entrance thresholds.

If that additional garage-specific threshold difference were repeated at Plot 23, it would be additional to the approximately 820 mm discrepancy already measured in the constructed ground-floor datum. The potential garage-threshold level would then be approximately 202.30 metres: 201.05 metres plus 0.82 metres plus 0.43 metres.

Against the stated driveway-entrance level of 201.50 metres, this would require a rise of approximately 800 mm over 8.15 metres, equivalent to an average gradient of approximately 9.8%, or about 1 in 10.2. Individual sections and transition points could be steeper than this overall average.

I am not asserting that the Plot 23 garage threshold has already been constructed at 202.30 metres. The garage has not yet been completed, and the approximately 430 mm figure at Plot 2 is an estimate rather than a surveyed measurement. However, the combination of the approximately 820 mm discrepancy measured at Plot 23, the apparent additional garage-threshold discrepancy at comparable dwellings, and the fundamental change this would make to the submitted driveway profile demonstrates why the garage threshold and full driveway levels must be independently established before the application is determined.

The issue is therefore not confined to the numerical gradient. The measured discrepancy would reverse the direction of the submitted driveway fall and materially alter the vertical relationship between the access, garage, dwelling and lower-ground accommodation. It could also raise the garage walls, eaves and ridge unless compensating reductions were made, thereby increasing the height, bulk, massing and visual dominance of the proposed double garage opposite No. 92.

Kirklees Council's Highways Guidance Note – Gradients states that gradients above 8% carry an increased risk of vehicles losing traction on icy surfaces; above 10%, some stationary vehicles may begin to slide; and paved surfaces sloping at more than 10% should not be counted as parking places. These considerations engage highway safety, the practical usability of the garage and driveway, drainage, vehicle grounding and the reliability of the claimed parking provision.

I therefore request that the application is not determined until the applicant has supplied, and the Council's Highways officers have assessed, a scaled longitudinal section through the full vehicular approach showing:

- the road, kerb, footway or shared-surface level at the site frontage, including independent verification of the stated 201.50-metre driveway-entrance level;
- the approved 201.05-metre garage-threshold level and the proposed garage threshold relative to the independently verified constructed ground-floor datum;
- the full approximately 8.15-metre driveway length, with existing and proposed spot levels throughout;
- the direction and gradient of each section of the driveway and all vertical transitions;
- the principal entrance threshold, garage threshold, garage eaves and garage ridge levels;
- the available level or near-level standing area immediately outside the garage doors;
- measures to prevent vehicle grounding and loss of traction;
- surface-water drainage arrangements, including prevention of run-off towards the highway, garage or lower-ground accommodation; and
- confirmation that the garage and any driveway spaces remain safely and practically usable as the parking provision claimed.

Verification Required Before Determination

Given that Plot 23 adopts the same design arrangement, together with the concerns already raised regarding its as-built levels and the apparent departure from approved threshold levels at Plot 2, I respectfully request that the Authority independently verifies:

- the existing road, footway/shared-surface and ground levels at the Plot 23 frontage, including the stated 201.50-metre driveway-entrance level;
- the approved and constructed lower-ground and principal finished-floor levels, including the approximately 820 mm discrepancy identified by my measurements;
- the approved 201.05-metre garage threshold and the proposed/as-built garage-threshold level relative to the constructed ground-floor datum;
- the garage eaves and ridge levels;
- the full approximately 8.15-metre driveway profile, including the direction and gradient of every section and all transition points; and
- the drainage and practical usability of the vehicular access, garage and parking areas.

Without that information and independent verification, the Authority cannot be satisfied that the submitted drawings accurately represent the development as constructed, nor properly assess the true height, scale, bulk, massing, visual impact, highway safety or parking functionality of the proposed double garage.

Conclusion

For the reasons set out above, I respectfully submit that the proposed double garage represents a significant increase in the scale and massing of Plot 23 and should be assessed as a substantial enlargement of the dwelling rather than simply the provision of additional parking.

The apparent departure from approved garage and entrance threshold levels at Plot 2 concerns the same developer, the same development and the same garage-above-accommodation arrangement. Taken with the approximately 820 mm discrepancy measured at Plot 23, it justifies verified as-built levels and a detailed driveway-gradient assessment before any decision is made. Depending upon the garage-threshold relationship ultimately constructed, the submitted 450 mm fall could instead become an average rise approaching 9.8%.

I also respectfully request that the Local Planning Authority clearly explains any departure from its previous conclusion that the double garage gave rise to concerns regarding overdevelopment.