

---

---

**From:**

**Sent:** 11 July 2021 17:13

**To:** DCAdmin <[DC.Admin@kirklees.gov.uk](mailto:DC.Admin@kirklees.gov.uk)>

**Subject:** Planning Application 2021/92016

Application Reference Number – 2021/92016

Dear Sir

We are writing to you with regards to the above planning application to object to the erection of the detached dwelling on land adjacent to No 2 The Bridge, on the following grounds:

Flooding Issues

Prior to the extension at No 2 The Bridge we had no flooding issues; our cellar was bone dry (No 1 The Bridge). Ever since, we have had varying levels of water in our cellar, necessitating the need for a pump connected to the main drains and a further pump on standby for emergency use, when required.

We are extremely concerned that the flooding issues have not been addressed in this planning application.

A few years' ago, early one morning we were notified by Mr Hirst of (No 2 The Bridge) that their kitchen was flooded and the source of the flood was our cellar. This resulted in a major flood that required four pumps in order to control the amount of water and get it down to a manageable level; our boiler at the time was situated in the cellar and was required to be relocated. The pumps were on all day from early morning until 6.00 pm pumping out gallons of clear water over the day, with the help of a chain of people passing bucket loads of water out of our property and onto the front lawn. Insurance claims were made by both properties due to the extent of the damage caused.

In an attempt to alleviate the problems we have added concrete layers to the floor and walls of our cellar on numerous occasions but to no avail, water is constantly present, at variable levels.

Our concerns are that the proposed dwelling will be situated higher than the two existing properties (No 1 and No 2 The Bridge) and therefore potentially that property would not be at risk from flooding; but could cause problems for the two existing properties down below, by potentially disturbing the water table levels and springs on excavation. As during excavation for the original extension to No 2 The Bridge a number of springs were unearthed requiring a Building Officer to inspect the area and necessitating the need for them to be re-diverted (at least 16 springs). As stated previously we had no problems with water in our cellar prior to this time. The additional concern and worry is that these problems arose when earth was excavated on the level of the two houses, this proposed development is above the two houses, as mentioned previously, and could potentially cause a major problem down below of unknown extremity. We are already unable to purchase home insurance pertaining to the flooding issues, due to the excessive costs involved.

Furthermore, it is very concerning the lack of acknowledgement in the Assessment of the Flood Risk, in

Section 11, on the planning application; when clearly there have been major issues in the past as stated above, and there is a real possibility of increasing the flood risk, should this be allowed to progress. Surely the site is within an area at risk of flooding, given the problems described, and to which on the planning application has been answered incorrectly. Also given that Mr Hirst has enquired on numerous occasions in the past regarding the water situation in our cellar, it is obviously a concern for both properties.

It is for these very reasons we strongly object to the proposed development moving forward, as we are extremely concerned about the potential and unknown impact that could result, to the lower properties No 1 and No 2 The Bridge.