Sent: 27 October 2026 19:50

Subject: 2024/62/92727/E Objection to planning application

Post
ANONYMOUSLY

OBJECTION TO PLANNING APPLICATION **2024/62/92727/E**
Land adjacent to Ashbourne Drive, Liversedge

Louise Bearcroft
Planning case officer
Kirklees Council

Application 2024/62/92727/E: land adjacent to Ashbourne Drive, Cleckheaton, previously described as Liversedge

Dear Ms Bearcroft,

I object to the revised 43 home proposal on the information currently available, focusing on documents registered from 21 September 2026 onwards. I recognise that the land is allocated for housing and welcome the reduction from 67 homes, removal of the former three storey house types and larger central open space. My main concern is the effect of the proposed heights and ground works on neighbouring homes and gardens.

1 House heights and neighbouring homes

The drawings do not yet clearly establish the proposed heights and levels compared with existing homes. Levels Layout 159.004.SK01 K allows changes of about 0.5 m either way. Additional Cross Sections Z168.008 A uses approximate levels for neighbouring floors and gardens.

Plot 29 beside 12 Ashbourne View is a particular concern. SK01 K shows its finished floor at 116.30 m on the drawing's height reference. It marks retaining structures of 2.15 m and 2.85 m beside the house, rising to 4.35 m and 4.70 m along the rear garden. The separation plan, document 1158280, shows 4.5 m and 7.5 m measurements, but these are not confirmed distances between habitable room windows. The house, ground levels, walls and fences need to be assessed together. These figures alone do not prove unacceptable harm.

I strongly object to the scale of the engineered platforms and retaining structures serving plots 24 to 29. This group includes four 2.5 storey Oakenshaw houses at plots 25 to 28, with rooms in the roof. I am

concerned that the combined height of the ground works, houses and fences could leave existing homes, particularly 12 Ashbourne View beside plot 29, dominated by a much higher development. The Council should require accurate sections confirming the relative floor, ridge and eaves levels. If these show unacceptable enclosure or loss of light, outlook or privacy, the platforms or houses should be lowered, or the layout changed, before permission is granted.

Please also assess plot 30 beside 25 Ashbourne Drive, where a 4 m measurement is shown; plot 1 beside 2 Ashbourne Croft; and plots 9 and 10 beside Ashbourne Croft. Section 2 of Z168.008 A describes plot 9 beside 6 Ashbourne Croft but labels the proposed house as plot 10. This needs correcting.

The Oakenshaw houses have rooms in the roof, including plots 12 and 13 and plots 15 and 16 near Penn Drive. Please check the effects of their upper windows and the sloping ground, including the concern raised by 30 Penn Drive. I recognise that lowering houses into the slope may reduce their impact. Blank side walls can reduce overlooking but do not settle concerns about loss of light or buildings dominating neighbouring homes.

Under Local Plan policy LP24 and the Housebuilders Design Guide, please require accurate sections through the affected homes and gardens, with fixed floor, ridge, eaves, garden, wall and fence levels using the same height reference. These should match Layout Z168.002 P02 and Sections Z168.007 B and Z168.008 A. Privacy, daylight and sunlight should be assessed where the measurements show a risk. Planting should not be used to justify otherwise unacceptable building heights.

2 Ground works and drainage

The Sirius cost quotation assumes a 1:3 slope, while SK01 K still shows a much steeper 1:1 embankment north of plots 24 to 29. The quotation also proposes spreading surplus topsoil over the central open space, subject to developer approval. Please confirm the actual design and ensure the levels, retaining walls, drainage, usable open space, tree protection, mine treatment and costs all agree.

Flood Exceedance Layout 159.004.SK08 shows one floodwater route along Ashbourne View and another via plot 9 to water collecting in the rear gardens of plots 8 and 9. Similar routes were accepted for the earlier scheme by the flood authority in May 2026, although drainage storage details still needed approval. Please confirm that the revised levels and drainage remain safe, including during blockages, and explain how routing water through private gardens meets policy LP28, which expects routes to avoid buildings and their gardens. Please also resolve the conflict between the flood report's requirement for floors above existing ground and plans to lower some houses into the slope.

3 Wildlife and developer contributions

The Planning Note lists biodiversity net gain report revision 6, which I could not find in the published resubmission. The 14 October Ecology response refers instead to a December 2025 report describing 67 homes. Although the ecologist gives qualified support, please publish the current report, calculations and habitat plan, and confirm they match the 43 home layout, final ground works and Landscape Masterplan H24-0012_001 I, under policy LP30.

Before accepting no affordable housing or other contributions, please publish or obtain an independent review of what the development can afford under policy LP11. Using current costs, it should test the actual proposal without affordable housing and whether reduced contributions could be made. The developer's assessment includes £76,239 for education, but the Council's 6 October response requests £0. Higher site costs may justify reduced contributions, but the figures must be consistent. Please also clarify the final open space provision and whether a later financial review is appropriate.

4 Other matters and the decision

Please resolve the Waste Strategy officer's concern about the bin route for plot 42, show that homes and open space have suitable accessible paths, and explain the lack of one and two bedroom homes. Please also assess the Heritage Statement's acknowledged minor harm using the final ground works and benefits that will actually be secured.

Please keep affected residents informed of meetings or site visits between the Council and the developer, with advance notice where practicable. Please publish substantive meeting notes and correspondence, including the Council's advice and the developer's responses, subject to lawful redactions. Residents should have a reasonable opportunity to comment on significant changes before a decision.

Please obtain and publish the information needed to assess these concerns before granting permission. If the confirmed scheme would cause unacceptable harm that cannot be resolved, I request refusal. Any necessary design changes should be settled before approval, with fixed heights and levels secured in the approved plans and conditions.

My fundamental concern is the scale of the proposed ground level changes, retaining structures and engineered platforms close to existing homes. The Council needs accurate existing levels and fixed proposed heights to assess whether the development would dominate neighbouring properties, cause enclosure, or harm privacy, outlook, daylight or sunlight.

Yours sincerely.