



STUDIO.G
ARCHITECTURAL

FORMAL SUPPLEMENTARY REPRESENTATION

Response to the Council's latest comments

2 Co-Op Lane

Hinchliffe Mill Conservation Area

PREPARED FOR

Kirklees Council

PREPARED BY

Studio G Architectural

PURPOSE

Supplementary planning representation

DATE

24 August 2026

FORMAL SUPPLEMENTARY REPRESENTATION

To: Joshua Merriman, Case Officer

Site: 2 Co-Op Lane, Hinchliffe Mill

Subject: Revised window arrangement and response regarding obscure glazing

Thank you for your continued engagement with us on the application. This document is submitted as a formal supplementary representation to the pending application and should be uploaded to the application file. It responds directly to the Council's latest comments and should be read alongside the amended drawings and updated heritage evidence listed below.

Submitted information

- Drawing 20-002 Rev A — Proposed Plans & Elevations
- Drawing 21-001 Rev A — Proposed Site Section
- Drawing 90-003 Rev A — Proposed Site Plan
- Updated Heritage Statement Rev B prepared by Ian Rowan, Heritage Consultant
- Four additional internal photographs taken at 1m, 2m, 3m and 4m from the proposed window opening

Revised architectural response

Following the Council's recommendations, we have accepted the principle of further reducing the scale of the opening. The revised arrangement now comprises three substantially smaller fixed glazed panels, each approximately 676mm wide × 1,192mm high, with a 715mm cill height. Reclaimed stone mullions, heads and cills remain proposed so that the composition more closely reflects the proportions, rhythm and traditional detailing of the existing windows elsewhere on the property.

We accept that this represents a more cohesive architectural response to the host building and the Conservation Area. Together with Ian Rowan's updated Heritage Statement, we believe it satisfactorily addresses the remaining concern raised by KC Conservation & Design.

Position on obscure glazing

We must, however, formally disagree with the recommendation that the revised windows should be obscurely glazed.

We fully appreciate the Council's responsibility to protect the residential amenity and privacy of neighbouring occupiers. Our position is not that privacy should be disregarded, but that any requirement for obscure glazing must be justified by the actual relationship between the properties and the degree of overlooking arising from this particular development.

The Council's House Extensions and Alterations SPD requires alterations to achieve reasonable levels of privacy and expressly identifies site levels as a principal consideration when assessing privacy. This is particularly important here because the relationship between No. 2 Co-Op Lane and the Water Street properties is fundamentally different from a conventional facing-window relationship on approximately level ground.

The significant change in levels has been accurately surveyed and is illustrated on Drawing 21-001 Rev A. The proposed windows sit materially above the properties on Water Street. The predominant outlook is therefore across their roofscape and towards the wider valley beyond, rather than directly into neighbouring habitable rooms.

Additional photographic evidence

To remove any uncertainty regarding the actual outlook, the Applicant has undertaken a controlled photographic exercise from inside the kitchen/dining room. The lower portion of the existing sliding doors was temporarily screened to a height of 715mm above finished floor level, accurately replicating the cill height of the revised windows.

Four photographic positions were precisely measured perpendicular to the internal face of the window wall at 1,000mm, 2,000mm, 3,000mm and 4,000mm. At each position, the photograph was taken centrally and square to the opening at approximately 1.6–1.7m above finished floor level, representing a typical standing eye level.

The photographs demonstrate the actual spatial relationship more clearly than a two-dimensional plan alone. They show that the potential for meaningful intervisibility with the Water Street properties is highly localised to the immediate area adjacent to the proposed windows. Once the viewer moves back into the kitchen/dining space, the substantial difference in levels means that the outlook quickly becomes predominantly one of roofs, landscape and the wider valley.

In practical terms, a person would need to deliberately position themselves immediately adjacent to the fixed glazing to obtain the greatest downward view. This is materially different from a conventional window overlooking neighbouring habitable rooms throughout the normal use of a room.

The revised proposal is also materially less intrusive than the existing arrangement. The current opening comprises large, floor-level openable sliding doors with a Juliet balustrade. The proposal removes that arrangement entirely and substitutes substantially smaller fixed windows with a raised 715mm cill.

Site visit and assessment of intervisibility

You previously confirmed that a site visit had been undertaken. However, our understanding is that this did not include an internal inspection from within No. 2 Co-Op Lane or from within Nos. 1 and 2 Water Street. Please correct us if that understanding is wrong.

We have some concern about reaching a firm conclusion that the development would cause an “unacceptable level of overlooking” without viewing the relationship from the relevant internal positions. This is not intended as criticism of the external site visit. In this instance, however, the planning issue is specifically one of intervisibility between internal spaces, and the very substantial vertical separation between the properties is central to that assessment.

Access to No. 2 has previously been offered and that offer remains open. We strongly encourage the case officer to perform an internal assessment in addition to the standard external visit. In the meantime, the photographic evidence in Appendix A accurately represents that experience.

Neighbour amenity and representations

There is no history of neighbour objection to either the first retrospective application or the current live application. The previous retrospective application, which related to the significantly more open and potentially intrusive arrangement of full-height opening patio doors and a Juliet balcony, received no neighbour representations.

For this application, the Applicant went further and actively engaged with the residents of Water Street. Signed letters confirming support for the revised proposal from the occupiers of Nos. 1a, 1, 2 and 3 Water Street were submitted with the Planning Statement.

We appreciate that the absence of objection does not, in itself, determine whether a planning impact exists. Nevertheless, it is highly relevant factual evidence in this particular case. The occupiers who experience the relationship between the properties daily — including those whom the Council seeks to protect from perceived overlooking — have expressly confirmed their support.

This is particularly significant when considered alongside the surveyed levels, the fixed nature of the proposed windows, the raised cill, the substantial reduction in glazing and the additional photographic evidence now provided.

Policy position

We do not consider that the relevant policies establish a requirement to prevent all intervisibility between residential properties.

Policy LP24 seeks a high standard of amenity for neighbouring occupiers, while Key Design Principle 3 of the House Extensions and Alterations SPD seeks reasonable levels of privacy. The SPD also identifies respect for site levels as a principal consideration when determining privacy. Similarly, Policy 2 of the Holme Valley Neighbourhood Development Plan seeks to minimise harmful impacts upon general amenity.

These are necessarily contextual tests. They require an assessment of whether the actual effect is harmful or unacceptable, rather than whether it is theoretically possible for one occupier to see towards another property from a particular position.

On the evidence now available, the very limited potential for overlooking does not amount to demonstrable harm sufficient to justify requiring all three windows to be obscurely glazed.

Obscure glazing would also have significant consequences for the quality and purpose of the opening itself. It would remove the long-distance outlook the revised windows are intended to provide and materially alter their external appearance. Given the substantial concessions already made and the evidence now submitted, such a measure would be disproportionate to the very limited potential impact identified.

Conclusion and request

The revised proposal represents a balanced and proportionate solution. We have listened to the Council and made a further meaningful design concession by substantially reducing the scale of the opening. This provides a more traditional architectural composition which responds positively to the host building, Hinchliffe Mill Conservation Area and the comments of KC Conservation & Design.

The case for clear glazing is supported by:

- the accurately surveyed topographical relationship;
- the revised site section;
- the substantially reduced and fixed window arrangement;
- the raised 715mm cill;
- four controlled eye-level photographs from measured positions within the room;
- the nature and position of the windows within the Water Street properties; and
- the absence of neighbour objection, together with explicit signed support from the occupiers of Nos. 1a, 1, 2 and 3 Water Street.

For these reasons, we respectfully request that the Council reconsider its recommendation for obscure glazing and assess the revised proposal with clear glazing.

We remain happy to engage constructively and, as previously offered, to facilitate an internal visit should this assist the final assessment.

Extension of Time

We note the request for an Extension of Time until 18 September 2026. We are happy to agree to this if the additional time is necessary to consult internally and properly consider the revised information. Equally, now that the amended drawings and additional evidence have been provided and our position is clear, we would have no objection to an earlier determination should the Council be in a position to reach a decision sooner.

Yours sincerely,

George Zubak
Studio G Architectural

APPENDIX A

CONTROLLED INTERNAL VIEWPOINT PHOTOGRAPHS

Purpose and methodology

The photographs on the following pages were taken from measured positions within the kitchen/dining room. The lower portion of the existing opening was screened to 715mm above finished floor level to replicate the revised cill height. Each view was taken centrally and square to the opening at an approximate standing eye level of 1.6–1.7m.

- 1,000mm from opening
- 2,000mm from opening
- 3,000mm from opening
- 4,000mm from opening

The sequence should be read as a progressive record of the outlook as the viewer moves back into the room. It illustrates how the downward view becomes increasingly restricted and how the predominant outlook resolves to the roofscape, landscape and wider valley.

Figure 1 — View from 1,000mm from the proposed window opening



Closest measured position: the greatest potential downward view is confined to the immediate area beside the glazing.

Figure 2 — View from 2,000mm from the proposed window opening



At 2,000mm, the outlook is already principally across the neighbouring roofscape and towards the wider valley.

Figure 3 — View from 3,000mm from the proposed window opening



At 3,000mm, the room context and raised 715mm cill demonstrate the increasingly limited downward outlook.

Figure 4 — View from 4,000mm from the proposed window opening



At 4,000mm, the view is predominantly long-distance; the vertical separation and raised cill materially restrict intervisibility.