DC Admin

From:
Sent: 02 December 2025 10:13
To: Farzana Tabasum
Subject: Subject: Formal Objection – Retaining Wall Submission (Ref: 2025/45/90964/E)

CAUTION: External email. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear all

Subject: Formal Objection – Retaining Wall Submission (Ref: 2025/45/90964/E)

Location: Land off Westgate, Cleckheaton BD19

I am submitting a formal objection to the retaining wall proposal on the grounds that the design is incomplete, technically unsound, and poses a significant safety risk to the existing residential properties along Quarry Road.

The documents recently uploaded to the planning portal largely reflect those I previously reviewed, but now include several cost-driven downgrades that substantially increase risk. Crucially, the design has not achieved technical approval, and Condition 16 cannot be discharged.

An email from Farhad Khatibi confirms that the AIP remains unsatisfactory and must be rewritten. This highlights a continued failure by the design team to consider the existing homes on Quarry Road, despite my property being only a few metres from the proposed wall and directly impacted by ground improvement works and level changes.

The submitted reports omit critical assessments, including:

- Foundation analysis of existing properties
- Structural condition surveys of affected buildings
- Modelling of settlement, surcharge, lateral movement, or ground displacement toward existing homes

The drawings themselves note that these checks are required, yet they remain incomplete. This is a serious omission given the weak and variable ground conditions at the boundary, which include collapsing trial pits, rapid groundwater ingress, and inconsistent made ground containing ash, clinker, slag, brick dust, and industrial waste.

Further concerns include:

- **Concrete specification downgrade:** Previous information indicated a need for a higher sulphate-resistant class, yet the current design specifies RC32/40 XF2, which is unsuitable for aggressive ground conditions.

- **Incorrect Consequence Class:** The wall has been classified as Class 2, despite the fact that failure would directly affect occupied homes with a high risk of injury or loss of life. The correct classification is Class 3.
- **Environmental risks ignored:** The RAMS identify silica dust requiring FFP3 protection and noise levels exceeding 88 dB, yet the Noise Impact Assessment fails to address these hazards. Residents remain absent from all documentation, despite the significant risks posed.
- **Party Wall Act compliance:** No notice has been issued, despite the proximity of my property.

Additionally, work units nearby have moss-covered roofs on suspected asbestos sheets, which could pose further exposure risks if disturbed by piling vibrations.

Given:

- The rejection of the AIP
- The inability to discharge Condition 16
- The omission of structural and geotechnical assessments for existing homes
- The downgraded concrete specification
- The incorrect Consequence Class
- The absence of noise, dust, and contamination impact assessments for Quarry Road residents

I strongly believe the retaining wall cannot be safely approved in its current form.

I request that the application is not progressed until a revised design is submitted that:

- Includes existing residential properties in all structural, geotechnical, and environmental assessments
- Specifies the correct concrete grade for sulphate resistance and ground aggressivity
- Applies the correct Consequence Class 3 classification
- Models ground movement, settlement, and surcharge toward existing homes
- Accurately assesses noise, dust, silica, contamination, and other construction impacts on Quarry Road residents
- Complies fully with Party Wall Act requirements

Please log this as a formal objection.

Kind regards,

56 Clare Rd

Cleckheaton

BD19 5HW