

## DC Admin

---

**From:**  
**Sent:** 31 July 2025 07:58  
**To:** DC Admin  
**Subject:** Planning application 2025-91606 - objection

From:

The Barn  
Scopsley Lane  
Whitley, Dewsbury  
WF12 0NG

31 July 2025

Objection to planning application 2025/91606  
Development: Change of use of outbuilding and land to dog hotel  
Location: Reservoir House, Whitley Road, Whitley, Dewsbury, WF12 0NQ

I write to make a further objection to the above planning application.

Planning for new developments must prioritise sustainability, and integrate with existing and planned transport infrastructure, to achieve a shift towards sustainable transport options including walking, cycling, and public transport, to minimise the use of private motor vehicles.

New developments must therefore be in accessible locations, having good access to public transport and local amenities.

Planning authorities are therefore required to ensure that proposed new developments are well connected to the wider public transport network and are well served by public transport, with frequent and reliable services.

There is a single bus service that passes through Whitley village - the number 230/230A Dewsbury-Grange Moor service. The operating times of that service have been reduced over time, most recently in January 2025, so as to now run just hourly between the hours of 09:27 and 16:24 only Monday to Saturday, with no Sunday service.

The service changes made in January 2025 involved stopping several early morning and late afternoon bus journeys.

This is despite the fact that there are no longer any amenities existing in Whitley village (no shop, no public house, no post office etc), so that transport to the nearest towns has become essential.

The development proposed is therefore clearly not a sustainable development.

It is not in a sustainable location, it does not have good connections to frequent and reliable public transport, and the application should be refused on these grounds alone.

However, as stated by another objector, I believe the application should in fact have been rejected as invalid, given the distinct lack of information and detailed plans necessary to make any proper assessment of its likely total harmful impact.

There should be further opportunity for public consultation if and when the requisite details are forthcoming.

For the record, the required Planning Notice posted at the site was removed prematurely, several days before the end of the public consultation period.

Regards

Sent from [Outlook](#)