

Concern Regarding Misleading Wording and Precedent Creation

I write to formally object to the determination of planning application 2025/92156 (Plot 27, Lingards Road) under delegated powers, on the grounds that the wording used to describe the proposal is misleading and masks a material intensification of use and scale. The application must be referred to the District Wide Planning Committee for proper scrutiny.

Misrepresentation of Development Scope

The application describes the proposal as a “**reconfiguration of approved Plot 27 to form 3 no. residential apartments**”. A reconfiguration implies a minor internal adjustment to an already approved dwelling. This is a mischaracterisation.

In reality, the proposal seeks to:

- Replace a previously approved single dwelling with **three self-contained residential flats**
- Introduce **communal infrastructure**, including a shared gym, refuse storage, bicycle facilities, and internal parking
- Alter the **site layout, circulation, and residential function** of the plot

This is not a reconfiguration—it is a **material redesign and functional intensification**, with implications for amenity, parking, refuse management, and estate character.

Embedding Vertical Intensification by Stealth

The proposal appears to be an attempt to **embed vertical intensification into the estate by stealth**. By framing the redesign as a reconfiguration, the application downplays the introduction of a four-level residential structure and the shift from single-family use to multi-unit occupancy. This tactic risks:

- **Circumventing committee oversight** through semantic framing
- **Normalising multi-storey, multi-unit development** on plots approved for single dwellings
- **Setting a precedent** for future applications seeking to exploit similar loopholes

Such a manoeuvre demands elected member scrutiny—not quiet approval under delegated powers.

Grounds for Committee Referral

Under Kirklees’ adopted Scheme of Delegation, case officers may not approve applications that:

- Represent a **material departure** from a previously approved scheme
- Introduce **functional intensification** or change of residential typology
- Raise **public interest or precedent risks** that warrant committee scrutiny

This proposal meets all of these criteria. Officer determination would breach procedural safeguards and undermine public confidence in the planning process.

Precedent: Application 2020/93954

In the case of 2020/93954, Kirklees officers correctly referred the application to committee due to its scale, public interest, and material impact. That decision reflects an established procedural standard: where a proposal materially alters the approved development form, committee oversight is required. The same principle must apply here.

Request for Action

I respectfully request that:

- Application 2025/92156 be referred to the **District Wide Planning Committee** for determination
- The misleading use of the term “reconfiguration” be formally acknowledged and corrected in all public-facing documentation
- The Council uphold the integrity of its planning process and ensure elected member oversight where warranted