

From:
Sent: 01 December 2025 20:57
To: Farzana Tabasum
Subject: Formal objection to unsafe retaining wall 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.

Formal Objection – Retaining Wall Submission (Condition 16)

2025/45/90964/E

Land off Westgate Cleckheaton bd19

I am formally objecting to the retaining wall submission on the basis that the design is incomplete, technically unsound and unsafe for the existing residential properties that back onto Quarry Road.

The information now uploaded to the planning portal largely matches the documents I previously reviewed, but it contains several value-engineered downgrades that significantly increase risk and must be highlighted. Most importantly, the documents confirm that the retaining wall design has not achieved technical approval and Condition 16 cannot be discharged.

The email from Farhad Khatibi explicitly states that the AIP is not satisfactory and must be rewritten. This demonstrates that, once again, the design team has failed to include or assess the existing homes on Quarry Road, despite my property being only a few metres from the proposed wall and directly affected by the ground improvement works and level changes.

None of the submitted reports include:

- any assessment of the foundations of existing properties

- any survey of the structural condition of our buildings
- any modelling of settlement, surcharge, lateral movement or ground displacement towards existing homes

The drawings even contain a note requiring these checks to be carried out, yet they have not been completed. This omission is extremely serious given that the ground at this boundary is weak, variable and partially unstable, with collapsing trial pits, rapid groundwater ingress and inconsistent made ground containing ash, clinker, slag, brick dust and industrial waste.

In addition, the concrete specification has been downgraded. Earlier information indicated the need for a higher sulphate-resistant class, yet the current design now specifies RC32/40 XF2, which is not appropriate for aggressive ground conditions. This raises concern that cost-saving has been prioritised over safety.

The wall has also been placed in Consequence Class 2, despite the fact that failure would directly affect existing occupied homes with a high risk of serious injury or loss of life. The correct classification is Consequence Class 3, and the failure to apply it mirrors the earlier omission in the contamination risk assessment, where the existing community was excluded from consideration altogether.

Environmental impacts have again been overlooked. The RAMS identify the presence of silica dust requiring FFP3 protection and noise levels exceeding 88 dB, yet the Noise Impact Assessment does not reflect these risks. Once more, existing residents are simply absent from the documentation, haven't we been put through enough already! To be placed in even more risk!

Furthermore, due to the proximity of my home, these works appear to fall under the Party Wall Act, yet no notice has been issued.

Given:

- the rejection of the AIP
- the inability to discharge Condition 16
- the omission of structural and geotechnical assessments relating to existing homes

- the downgraded concrete specification
- the incorrect Consequence Class
- the absence of noise, dust and contamination impact assessments for Quarry Road residents

I do not believe the retaining wall can be safely approved in its current form.

I request that the application is not progressed until a full and correct design is submitted that:

1. Includes the existing residential properties in all structural, geotechnical and environmental assessments.
2. Uses the appropriate concrete grade for the sulphate class and ground aggressivity.
3. Applies the correct Consequence Class 3 classification.
4. Properly models ground movement, settlement and surcharge towards existing homes.
5. Accurately assesses noise, dust, silica, contamination and other construction impacts on the established homes on Quarry Road.
6. Complies with all Party Wall Act requirements.
7. Work units in close proximity have moss laden roofs, on suspected asbestos roof sheets, this could be another risk for exposure due to piling vibrations should large amounts of moss be displaced

Please log this formal objection

Kind regards

58 Clare Road
Cleckheaton
Bd19 5hw