

DC Admin

From:
Sent: 13 August 2026 20:23
To: DC Admin
Subject: Planning application 2026/91900 – Supplementary
objection regarding access to No. 68
Attachments: file_000000003ab08246a3882d5115d97ca8.png
Categories:

Final Clarification and Evidence – Application 2026/91900

Dear Mr Evans,

I am submitting one final clarification regarding application 2026/91900, together with an annotated photograph that illustrates the physical features affecting access at No. 68.

The applicant's stated 70 cm access width is not the usable width. The plans measure boundary-to-wall, but the actual usable width is reduced by several fixed physical features that are not shown on the drawings:

Step projection — the step projects approximately 50 cm into the access

Wall recess — reduces the usable width further

Drainpipe projection — projects into the access

Brick nib projection — further reduces usable width

Turning angle — prevents straight access past the gate

These features reduce the usable width to approximately less than 20–35 cm, which is not sufficient for access, maintenance, or safe passage. This is a material inaccuracy in the submitted plans.

The site plan states "Access to be maintained for No. 68."
The extension as drawn would not maintain usable access.

The annotated photograph attached clearly shows:

- the step projection
- the recess
- the drainpipe
- the brick nib
- the pinch-point usable width

- the turning angle
- the height difference between the properties

These features collectively demonstrate that the usable width is significantly less than stated.

My patio is the only usable part of my garden, as the remainder floods. The increased massing would further overshadow this space, resulting in material amenity harm

Summary of Material Harm

Inaccurate plans — usable width is 20–35 cm, not 70 cm

Loss of access — physical features make the access unusable

Contradiction with site plan — “Access to be maintained for No. 68” cannot be achieved

Overshadowing — increased massing would further overshadow my only usable garden space

Amenity impact — patio is the only functional outdoor area due to flooding elsewhere

Height difference — higher ground level increases overshadowing and enclosure

Cumulative harm — access, amenity, overshadowing and inaccuracies together create significant material impact

I hope this clarification and the attached annotated photograph assist in the accurate assessment of the proposal.

Kind regards,

68 Ainley Road
Birchencliffe, Huddersfield

Date: 11/08/2026 at 7:01 pm

To: dc.admin <dc.admin@kirklees.gov.uk>

Subject: Fwd: Final comment - Planning application 2026/91900 – Supplementary objection regarding access to No. 68

Dear Mr Evans,

I wish to add a factual point regarding access. The only route to my rear garden is via the shared side area. This access is sometimes obstructed, which already makes it difficult to maintain the boundary, manage drainage, and reach the rear of my property safely.

On several occasions, gardeners, window cleaners and delivery drivers have had to ask for items to be moved in order to reach my rear garden.

The proposed extension would reduce this access further, creating a narrow corridor that would make maintenance and drainage management significantly harder. I ask that this impact on amenity and practical access be considered as part of the assessment.

Many thanks,

Date: 05/08/2026 at 5:51 am

To: dc.admin <dc.admin@kirklees.gov.uk>

Subject: Final comment - Planning application 2026/91900 – Supplementary objection regarding access to No. 68

Dear Officer,

Apologies for the multiple emails; I just wanted to ensure my comments were clear and complete.

The drawings measure a 70 cm gap from a straight boundary line, but this does not represent the actual usable width at my property. The real access route includes a recess, a level change, steps, a pipe, brickwork and a 90-degree turn, none of which are shown on the plans. These features significantly reduce the usable width at ground level, which is where access is required for maintenance and moving items.

The plans also omit drainage details along this side passage, and they show a mechanical extractor fan positioned directly beside my only rear access point. Both issues have a direct effect on how I am able to use and maintain my property.

Because of these omissions, the 70 cm measurement on the drawing does not reflect the actual pinch-point, and I would be grateful if this could be considered when assessing the proposal.

I have attached a photo of the recess and level change for clarity.

Kind regards,

Date: 05/08/2026 at 3:16 am

To: dc.admin <dc.admin@kirklees.gov.uk>

Subject: Planning application 2026/91900 – Supplementary objection regarding access to No. 68

I appreciate the consultation period has ended, but I would like to provide one additional clarification and a single photograph that may assist in assessing daylight and amenity.

My kitchen is a habitable room with two large windows, a smaller one and a half-glazed back door. We use this space daily as a combined kitchen/dining/living area. The proposed extension would sit on higher ground and on the side from which direct sunlight reaches both the kitchen and the adjoining patio.

The attached photograph shows the shadow cast across my patio by the existing boundary fence. My garden sits lower than the neighbouring property, and the sun comes from that side, so even the current fence creates significant shading of the patio. This patio is the only usable part of my garden due to drainage issues in the lower section.

As the proposed extension would be substantially taller than the fence and a solid structure, I hope this additional information can assist in assessing overshadowing and amenity.

Thank you for your time.

Many thanks,

