

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>Please note this is the second part of my objection letter reference 2025-62-91168-E 6th July as the portal does not allow the attachment of a file and is word limited. I have sent a full copy of the letter to the case officer by email.</p> <p>“As a result, it is the Councils view that in this circumstance, the development is in breach of planning control and the development can be regarded as being unauthorised in its entirety.”</p> <p>Additionally, in the email communication from the case office Charlotte Hancock to me dated 11th April 2025 she states:</p> <p>“With regard to the site visit previously undertaken, the gates were closed at the time of serving the TSN therefore I was unable to access the site. However, I was able to view the building from a different vantage point whereby I could see that it was higher than approved. Additionally, I have received other forms of evidence to demonstrate the current building at the site however I am not at liberty to share this information”</p> <p>These clearly indicates that the applicant has, in my opinion, deliberately attempted to undermine and circumvent the considered opinions, decisions and approvals of the Council and as such this, in isolation to any other matter, is sufficient to reject the planning application and instruct the applicant to amend his works to comply with the original planning approval granted for application 2022/62/933660/E, including any other non-compliant areas identified in my letter dated 6th January 2025.</p> <p>4. Other matters that I believe need to be considered in this planning application and / or the Building Inspector, include:</p> <p>(i) The drainage works included on the drawings have not yet been constructed and it is difficult to understand how these could be constructed properly after the complete erection of the steelwork and foundations.</p> <p>(ii) I do not believe that the foundation works have been completed in accordance with the drawings in respect of reinforcement and formwork during casting. In particular I do not believe that the holding down bolts have been “cast in” with the concrete pour with suitable formwork. I believe that they have all been drilled post casting.</p> <p>(iii) The retaining walls included on previous planning applications have not been constructed which adversely impacts upon the safety of the site during construction.</p>	

constructed which adversely impacts upon the safety of the site during construction works, particularly the existing buildings and the embankment to my own property.

This was raised on my previous letter.

(iv) The applicant has not constructed the works as they stand with due respect to the existing trees. He has crudely hacked away branches that were impeding the portal frame construction, which is 2m higher than authorised. I also do not believe he has "crown lifted the designated tree identified in the original planning approval.

This development has been an ongoing saga for a number of years under various guises, and a rejection decision is needed to send a clear message to applicant that he cannot unilaterally breach the council's planning regulations and approvals by deliberately manipulating due process, presumably on the basis that the passage of time erodes the need for decisive action.

I strongly request the Council to:

(i) Reject this application 2025/62/91168/E in its entirety, and

(ii) Instruct the applicant to either remove all of the works constructed to date or amend/re-configure the current works so that they comply fully with the existing approval for application 2025/62/91168/E.

Note: This previously approved application has a restriction on hours of working in operation whereas the new application does not. I assume that the hours of work in operation are already deemed part of the new application?

Such a rejection and instruction would send a clear message to the applicant that ignoring the decisions and approvals of the council cannot be allowed and that the good work and integrity of the Council and the officers of the Kirklees planning department is maintained

I would be grateful if you could keep me apprised on any development in respect of this application and would be pleased to attend any council or planning meeting that debates or considers this application.

Yours faithfully,