Sent: 12 July 2022 08:47
To: John Ritchie <John.Ritchie@kirklees.gov.uk>; ChiefExecutiveSecretaries <ChiefExecutiveSecretaries@kirklees.gov.uk>; Lee Stoney <Lee.Stoney@kirklees.gov.uk>; Julia Steadman <Julia.Steadman@kirklees.gov.uk>
Cc: Laura Yeadon <Laura.Yeadon@kirklees.gov.uk>; DCAdmin <DC.Admin@kirklees.gov.uk>
Subject: Re: Objection to planning application 2021/92507 now 2022/44/92309/W

Hi Laura

I have seen that following the appeal to overturn the refused descision by kirklees planning, Mr mathers has submitted 2022/44/92309/W.

The appeal decision clearly states "obscure glazing" and cladding that complements the appearance.

Mr Mathers has suggested the use of obscure film. This is as temporary as tilting the blinds and is not acceptable, full replacement of the glazing with perminant obscured glazing is necessary as the appeal decision states must be retained. Film can simply peel off. Also due to the angle of vision the gaps at the bottom still permits vision to our garden and the top still gives vision to our living rooms.

With regards to the cladding and images shown, Mr mathers has sent a photo of the opposite side of the house, the relevant side of the house has red cladding

Further more there is still an outstanding issue of a live enforcement case COMP/20/0245 and the fact that the submitted plans that have now been passed are untrue as it shows Mr Mathers has access down the side of the building which is 100% inacurate as he has breached the boundary, which is also still an outstanding dispute that i have repeatedly asked for an update and simply nothing back.