

About the application

Application number: 2025/91168	
What is the application for?:	Demolition of existing garage and erection of MOT bay/service area (within a Con
Address of the site or building:	Wilton Mills, 586, Bradford Road, Batley, WF17 8LP
Postcode:	WF17 8LP

User comments

Type of comment: An objection	
Do you wish your comments to be published on the website anonymously?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
<p>I have submitted a letter to the casde officer letter reference 2025-62-91168-E 6th July pdf version outlining my objection. I have pasted the first part of the text of the letter here as the system does not allow me to attach a file and is words limited. I will attached the remainder on a separate comment.</p> <p>Dear Sirs,</p> <p>Re: Planning Permission 2025/62/91168/E Demolition of existing garage and erection of MOT bay/service area (within a conservation area). Objection to Planning Submission</p> <p>I am writing as the owner and resident of</p> <p>strongly object to the current planning application on a number of grounds which are explained herein.</p> <p>Noting that this is a retrospective planning application to a previously approved application 2022/62/933660/E, I also continue to raise the serious concerns and issues in my previous letter dated 6th January 2025 which is a matter of record on your files together with the items in my subsequent e-mail correspondences with Charlotte Hancock (case officer for that application 2022/62/933660/E) all of which are, in my opinion, still valid and carry weight to my objection.</p> <p>My objection to this retrospective planning application 2025/62/91168/E includes, but is not limited to the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. All of the reasons contained in my letter dated 6th January 2025 and subsequent email correspondences with the case officer at that time, as noted in the second paragraph above.2. The applicant commenced construction works in accordance with the original approved plans to a partially constructed state. He then dismantled/demolished this	

approved plans to a partially constructed state. He then dismantled/demolished this work and replaced with a different and increased portal frame design to lines, levels and heights in excess of the planning approval in place. He commenced this action unilaterally without warning, consultation or consideration of both adjoining properties and importantly the Kirklees Planning Authority. This demonstrates to me that the applicant has total dis-regard of the important work that the Kirklees Planning Authority carries out and in my opinion is a flagrant and deliberate action to circumvent the planning approval process in the hope that a retrospective application will be automatically approved.

There are numerous differences between the current works as constructed to the originally approved development including, but not limited to:

- Approved footprint under application 2022/93360 is 16,513 x 10,952mm. Submitted footprint under application 2025/91168 is 17,025 x 14,001mm. The constructed footprint is bigger than the approval granted.
- Approved height of structure under application 2022/93360 is 6,900mm (including parapet. Submitted height of structure under application 2025/91168 is 8,825mm. The current construction is almost 2 metres higher than the council approved.
- The approved structure under application 2022/93360 was a cladded steel frame with sloping roof with Parapet to the viewing onlookers. The constructed structure is a portal steel frame with pitched roof showing rooflights to onlookers with no parapet.
- On the application in the section asking any effect on trees and hedges the applicant has ticked/stated "No". This is not true. There are adjacent trees and hedges some of which have already been cut back by the contractor executing the work.
- On the application in the section asking any effect or proposals for Trade Effluent the applicant has ticked/stated "None". This is not true. What are the proposals in respect of water, oil, hydraulic and other fluids from the service of cars and vehicles. How does he plan to ensure safe disposal and protect the environment and local species (including bats)?
- On the Design Access Statement the applicant has stated that "it will complement previous design details as approved". This is not true and in my opinion is a deliberate ploy by the applicant to mislead Council and neighbouring properties. How can this complement the previous application when the structure footprint is 57 square metres in plan and 2 metres higher than approved. This is a clear mis-statement in his application.
- On the application the applicant has ticked/noted that this structure is unseen from the main road. This is not true. The structure at the height constructed is clearly visible from surrounding road including but not limited to Carlinghow Hill, Centenary Way and Bradford Road. This is another misleading statement in the application.
- The design of the current structure is different to that previously approved. The new structure of a portal frame with pitched roof is totally different to the previous structure of a flatter roof surrounded by a parapet. This means the higher structure as constructed will expose the roof lights to my view and that of other neighbouring properties.

I would suggest that the application submitted to the Council is flawed and is not a truthful and complete application. In my opinion it has been submitted in a deliberate attempt to confuse both the council and to circumnavigate his intentions all along i.e to gain initial approval and then construct a facility bigger and higher than approved in the

hope this will be passed in a retrospective application and without contacting the Council or neighbouring properties. This demonstrates a total disregard for the planning process, the work and integrity of the Council and the effects on his neighbours.

3. On the 30th January 2025 Kirklees issue a Temporary Stop Notice. Item 3 of this notice clearly shows that the works are in breach of the approvals granted, in particular it's height and dominance over adjacent properties. I have not re-produced the text of this notice in its entirety, as it is a matter of record, however I would quote the summary position of the Temporary Stop Notice as follows:

The remainder of my letter is on a separate comment.