DC Admin

From:
Sent: 01 December 2025 14:15
To: Farzana Tabasum
Cc: Cllr Andrew Pinnock; Cllr Kath Pinnock; Cllr John Lawson
Subject: Another objection to the 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.

Hi Farzana
I've taken time off work to investigate thoroughly and have now gone through the above application in full. At first it was to fact check the claims from pollution received on Friday. They are wrong as usual.

The information on the portal corresponds with the information I was given a few months ago but with a few minor value engineered, dangerous downgrades that must be pointed out.

So yet again I am writing to object to the retaining wall submission because the information now on the portal confirms that the design has not achieved technical approval and Condition 16 cannot be discharged. The email from Farhad Khatibi makes it clear that the AIP is not satisfactory and must be rewritten. This proves that once again the design has omitted the existing residential properties on Quarry Road, even though my home and garage sit a few metres from the proposed wall and are directly affected by the ground improvement and level changes.

None of the reports include any assessment of our foundations, any survey of our building condition or any modelling of settlement, surcharge or ground movement towards existing homes. The drawings even contain a note requiring these checks, but they have not been carried out. This is especially serious because the ground at this boundary is weak, variable and in places unstable, with collapsing trial pits, rapid groundwater ingress and inconsistent made ground containing ash, clinker, slag, brick dust and industrial waste.

I am also concerned that a higher sulphate concrete class was indicated earlier, yet the current design specifies RC32/40 XF2 which is a downgrade and not suitable for aggressive ground. The wall has been placed in Consequence Class 2 even though failure would directly affect existing homes and high risk of loss of life, meaning the correct category is Consequence Class 3. This omission mirrors what happened in the contamination risk assessment where existing residents were deliberately excluded.

Contamination, noise and dust risks have not been considered for the existing street. The RAMS identify silica dust requiring FFP3 protection and noise levels above 88 decibels but the Noise Impact Assessment does not include these facts. Again, existing residents simply do not exist in the documentation. The proximity of my home also suggests the works fall under the Party Wall Act, yet no notice has been issued.

Given the rejection of the AIP, the inability to discharge Condition 16 and the omissions across structural, geotechnical and environmental assessments, I do not believe the retaining wall can be

approved safely as it stands. I ask that the application is not progressed until a full and correct design is submitted that includes existing residential properties, uses the appropriate concrete for the sulphate class, applies the correct CC3 classification and properly assesses movement, surcharge, noise, dust and contamination risks to the established homes on Quarry Road.

Thank you for your time.

Kind regards,