

DC Admin

From:
Sent: 09 July 2025 17:24
To: DC Admin
Subject: Planning 2025/62/91168/E

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

Dear whom it may concern,

I have oppose the above planning, my views are attached.

Kind regards,

2025/62/91168/E Wilton Mills 586 Bradford Road, Batley, WF17 8LP

Demolition of existing garage and erection of MOT bay/service bay/storage area (within a conservation area)

I strongly oppose the above planning application for the following reasons

1 Height of structure

2 Construction Materials of building

3 Increase in floorspace

4 Negative impact on local character within a conservation area.

5 Undermining of planning process.

1 The height of the structure is more than was approved on previous planning. It totally overwhelms the area. Photo 1 show the rearview that backs on to the back-to-back terrace houses at the bottom of Carlinghow lane. The rear houses would suffer the worst with overshadowing and loss of natural light resulting in light deprivation. In addition, the detached house On the corner of Carlinghow Hill and Chinewood Avenue would suffer over shadowing and light deprivation. Photo 6 shows the existing building roof line to the left of the construction. On the approved planning the roof height was slightly above this level. Photo 1 and 3 also show the buildings size from Bradford Road and how it overshadows the area. As you can see it is not hidden as stated in the application Heritage-Design and Access Statement, it is full on, look at me the building that was built without planning permission!

2 From the photos supplied you can see the type of materials used in this area of Cross bank conservation area, metal sheeting is totally inappropriate, a combination of stone, brick, slate and rendering should be used. If rendering is used the bare block work should be enforced to be finished to a satisfactory standard. The Cross Bank Conservation area was set up specifically to help preserve the area distinct character for generations to come. At the time the Conservation area was set up Stan Driver, principal planning officer for conservation and design said "Planning applications would need deeper scrutiny in some areas, Councillors will have to think harder, as well as applicants." Photo 6 shows an example of this with Harry's takeaway being built from stone. The applicants state in the Heritage-Design and Access Statement that "The result will be a purpose built unit Typical of many similar units in the area. The site is unseen from the main road and largely hidden from site" is untrue and incorrect. The photos show that it is clearly seen from Bradford Road and Carlinghow Hill. The site is also overlooked By Chinewood avenue with upper floors having a bird's eye view. I strongly disagree with the adjective Typical and many similar units as again this is untrue. The new B an M store on Mayman Lane was even stone fronted and that wasn't planted in the middle of housing (Housing to 3 sides)

3 The footprint of the building is being increased from 150 to 238 metres squared a whopping 58.5 percent increase from what planning was consented. More space, more cars, more noise pollution effecting the surrounding neighbours. This increase has been seized by the applicant with no

consideration to the neighbours. This building should be taken down and built to the specifications in the existing planning.

4 This building will be like a blot on the landscape surrounded by historic buildings, The tram shed, National school 521 Bradford Road(listed). The photos attached show the type of building in the immediate area, it will have a negative impact on the local character, within a conservation area. The building does not align with buildings that surround it, it is not hidden from view.

5 Noise, pollution and traffic all increased, the applicant makes claims that the garage has operated for years without problems, again this is a fabrication how would he know I've lived here 20 years plus and that is not the case. The applicant has caused significant problems with his neighbours by not following the correct planning and building procedures. This applicant has undermined the whole trust we have in the planning permission process that as Kirklees citizens we feel should protect the area we live, especially within a conservation area. Rules have been broken on numerous occasions. Twice stop notices have been issued, retaining walls that support banking stability have not been built, earth piled up against neighbour's wall causing collapse. The steel frame that has been built without planning looks structurally unsound.

Opening times-This application opening times are requested as 8 to 6 Monday to Friday and 8 to 4 on a Saturday. I don't agree with opening till 4 on a Saturday and should be amended to 8 to 5.30 Monday to Friday and 9 to 12 on a Saturday to protect the residents down time.

New Jobs-Again, this is trying to tick all the right boxes, they are moving from another location round the corner, still in Carlinghow.

Outside mechanical work-Hopewell Street has 5 residential properties with the rear of these properties facing the said development. Because of the position of the garage with a mill wall to one side and a banking to the other it is like a sound tunnel where noise gets exaggerated, hence the restrictions put on previous planning approvals that all work should be carried out inside the garage with doors closed. The proposal will NOT enhance the area. The Cross Bank Conservation Area in this part of Batley is supposed to protect the area from developments which do not fit. If Kirklees council does not enforce its planning decisions it makes, then what is the point. We notified Kirklees about this rogue development and if action had been taken quicker the build would have been stopped.

Kind Regards

Planning application 2025/62/91168/E

Photo 1



Photo 2



Photo 3



Photo 4

Photo 5



Photo 6



Photo 7

