

DC Admin

From:
Sent: 20 August 2026 13:48
To: DC Admin
Cc: Cllr Anthony Smith
Subject: No 4 Final Comment: Revised plans - Planning application 2026/91900

Categories:

Dear Mr Evans,

I am writing with one final representation following the revised plans and after reviewing the previously approved application 2020/90621.

I do not wish to repeat my earlier objections. However, I have identified several points from the Council's own 2020 assessment which I believe are directly relevant to the revised proposal and which I would be grateful if you could consider before determining the application.

1. Previous approval and access to No. 68

The 2020 delegated officer report specifically records that the plans were amended to widen the side passageway. The officer also noted when assessing the rear extension that it was set away from the boundary to allow access to the adjacent property.

This appears particularly relevant because the approved 2020 ground-floor plan showed the rear extension at approximately 5.665m wide and showed approximately 955mm at the access beside the rear extension.

The revised 2026 proposal now shows a rear extension approximately 6.15m wide and an 800mm dimension.

Although I appreciate that each application must be considered on its own merits, the current extension therefore remains approximately 485mm wider than the previously approved rear extension, with less separation at the side.

Given that widening the passage and setting the rear extension away from the boundary were specifically relevant to the Council's assessment in 2020, I would be grateful if the current reduction in separation could be specifically considered.

2. Whether the stated 800mm is actually clear usable access

My concern is not simply whether 800mm is an acceptable dimension in principle.

It is whether the revised drawing actually provides 800mm of **clear, usable access on the physical site**.

As explained in my previous representations, the existing steps, gate, recessed wall arrangement and other fixed projections affect the actual geometry at this point. The 2020 approved plan also appears to represent this stepped/recessed arrangement differently from the current proposal.

The revised 2026 ground-floor plan itself shows different dimensions along this side, including 770mm and 800mm, rather than demonstrating a continuous 800mm clear route.

I would therefore respectfully ask that the physical position of the steps, gate, recess and boundary is checked against the revised drawing before relying upon the stated 800mm measurement.

I am not asking the Council to accept my own calculation of what the extension width should be. My concern is simply that the available width should be established from the actual fixed site geometry before the proposed footprint is accepted.

3. Amenity comparison with the 2020 approval

I also note that the 2020 officer's assessment of the impact on No. 68 specifically took account of the fact that my property is on slightly lower land, that the rear extension was set away from the shared boundary, and that its projection was approximately 3m.

The current proposal retains a similar 3m projection but increases the width of the rear extension and reduces its separation from the No. 68 side compared with the approved 2020 scheme.

I would therefore be grateful if the effect of that changed relationship were specifically assessed in terms of overshadowing, outlook and enclosure at No. 68, particularly in relation to my kitchen and adjoining patio.

As previously evidenced, the existing boundary fence already casts substantial shadow across this patio. The patio is also particularly important to the enjoyment of my property because of the drainage problems affecting the remainder of my garden.

4. Existing drainage conditions

I would also like to clarify the extent of the existing drainage problem.

I have had to create a channel through my garden in an attempt to direct and manage water entering the garden, including water associated with the existing drainage/run-off from No. 70. Despite doing this, the lawn still becomes extremely boggy and waterlogged.

I mention this not to ask the planning process to determine responsibility for the existing drainage problem, but because it demonstrates the existing site conditions and why the patio/top part of my garden is the area I can reliably use.

I am therefore concerned by the revised plan showing a new manhole and drainage connection while stating that the exact location and direction of the existing drainage are still to be determined on site.

I would be grateful if the drainage implications of the proposed additional built footprint could therefore be considered and, in particular, that the development should not result in additional surface water being discharged towards or affecting No. 68.

5. Site visit

Given that these issues depend heavily upon the physical geometry, levels, steps/recess and the relationship between the proposed extension and No. 68, I would be very grateful if the officer could view the relationship from my property before determining the application.

I am happy to provide access to No. 68 for that purpose at a convenient time.

Finally, could you please confirm that my representations following the revised plans, including my email of 19 August, are on the application file and will be available to the case officer when the application is determined? I appreciate that there may be a delay before representations appear on the public website.

Thank you for your time in considering my comments. I appreciate that I have submitted a number of representations, and I do not intend to send further comments unless there is another material amendment or you require information from me.

Kind regards,

68 Ainley Road

From:

Sent: 19 August 2026 14:04

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

Cc: Cllr Anthony Smith <anthony.smith@kirklees.gov.uk>

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

Dear Mr Evans,

I am writing further to my previous representations regarding planning application 2026/91900, following the publication of the revised plans dated 17 August 2026.

I understand from Councillor Anthony Smith that the revised proposal increases the stated access gap from 700mm to 800mm and reduces the proposed extension width from approximately 6.32m to 6.15m.

I appreciate that the proposal has therefore been amended, but I remain concerned that the underlying issues I have raised have not been fully addressed.

1. Access and the 800mm measurement

The revised plan appears to measure the 800mm from the straight boundary/fence line to the proposed extension.

However, the existing three steps and gate project into this area, and the existing wall has a recessed section which is not represented in the same way as on the previously approved 2020 plans.

My concern is therefore not simply the numerical width shown on the drawing, but whether the revised proposal actually provides 800mm of clear, usable access once the existing steps and gate arrangement are taken into account.

The previous approved scheme showed an access dimension of approximately 955mm and a materially different recessed arrangement. I would therefore be grateful if the officer could

specifically check the revised drawing against the physical site and the 2020 approved plans, rather than relying solely on the 800mm dimension shown.

2. Existing recess and site geometry

I remain concerned that the existing recessed section has not been accurately represented on the revised proposal.

This is important because changing the representation of the recess affects the apparent relationship between the extension, boundary and access. I would therefore ask that the existing site geometry, including the recess, steps, gate and boundary, is accurately established before concluding that the revised access arrangement is acceptable.

3. Increased footprint

Although the proposal has now been reduced from approximately 6.32m to 6.15m, the revised extension remains substantially wider than the approximately 5.665m extension shown on the previously approved 2020 scheme.

I would be grateful if the additional footprint and its resulting impact on my property were considered, rather than the amendment being assessed solely on the increase from 700mm to 800mm.

4. Light, outlook and garden/patio amenity

I remain concerned about the additional loss of light and outlook caused by the increased footprint and proximity of the proposed extension to my property.

The patio is the main usable part of my garden, as the remainder of the garden is frequently waterlogged and difficult to use. I would therefore ask that the impact on the actual usability and enjoyment of this area is properly assessed.

5. Drainage

I also remain concerned about surface water and drainage.

The revised drawing now refers to a new manhole and new drainage connection, but also states that the exact location and direction of the existing drainage is to be determined on site.

Given the existing surface-water problems affecting my garden, I would ask that the proposed drainage arrangements are properly established before determination and that the development does not increase surface-water runoff or otherwise worsen drainage affecting my property.

6. Access to my garden for construction

I also wish to formally record that I do not give the applicant, their contractors, builders or any other person acting on their behalf permission to enter my garden or access my land for the purpose of carrying out the proposed development.

Please treat this email as written notice that I do not consent to any such access.

I have not agreed to provide access to my property for construction, scaffolding, materials, equipment, waste removal or any other works associated with the proposed development.

I appreciate that the planning application itself does not determine private rights of access or other civil matters, but I wish to make my position regarding consent to entry onto my land absolutely clear.

Finally, I would be grateful if you could confirm that all of my previous representations have been received and placed on the application file, as I have submitted further comments recently which do not yet appear to have been uploaded to the public planning record.

I would particularly appreciate confirmation that those representations will be available to the officer and taken into account when the application is determined.

I would also be grateful if the revised plans and any subsequent representations could be made available on the public application record where appropriate, given that the consultation period has now been extended.

I appreciate that the application remains under consideration and I am grateful for your time in reviewing these points.

Kind regards,

68 Ainley Road