

DC Admin

From:
Sent: 10 September 2025 18:43
To: DC Admin
Subject: Formal Objection to Planning Application 2025/92156 – Plot 27 Redevelopment Proposal

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

I write to formally object to planning application 2025/92156, which proposes the redevelopment of Plot 27 into a four-storey block of flats with communal facilities and a single garage. This proposal represents a material departure from both the approved scheme and the established character of the surrounding area.

1. Misrepresentation of Context

The submitted Design and Access Statement (DAS) mischaracterises the local context. It claims the surrounding area is “mixed,” with varied building heights and typologies. This is demonstrably inaccurate. The immediate vicinity comprises exclusively 2–3 storey detached and semi-detached dwellings. There are no four-storey buildings, no blocks of flats, and no communal-use structures of comparable scale.

The DAS also frames Plot 27 as a “central plot,” implying strategic importance that was never recognised in the original approval. The delegated officer report for 2020/62/93954 (ref. 972227) treated Plot 27 as one of several domestic-scale dwellings, with no indication of intensified use or landmark status.

2. Departure from Approved Scheme

The original approval for Plot 27 was for a four-bedroom detached house. The current proposal introduces:

- A fourth storey, breaking the approved roofline rhythm
- A change in use from single dwelling to multiple flats
- A communal floor and single garage, incompatible with the density and parking expectations of the area

This is not a modest revision—it is a fundamental change in scale, use, and impact.

3. Visual Intrusion and Amenity Harm

The proposed height and massing will result in:

- Overlooking of adjacent properties
- Overshadowing of gardens and habitable rooms
- Loss of privacy and visual amenity

The sloping topography exacerbates this impact, as the proposed structure will dominate the skyline from lower elevations.

4. Parking and Highway Safety

While the application includes four surface parking spaces and a single garage (reserved for Apartment One), this provision remains functionally inadequate:

- No visitor bays are provided, risking overspill onto Lingards Road and neighbouring plots
- The garage exclusivity introduces inequity in provision and operational impracticality
- No swept path analysis is provided to demonstrate safe access and egress
- No electric vehicle charging strategy is included, contrary to sustainability expectations under Local Plan Policy LP20

The parking layout is numerically minimal, functionally inequitable, and strategically incomplete.

5. Policy Conflict

The proposal conflicts with:

- **Kirklees Local Plan Policy LP24** – Design and character
- **LP35** – Residential amenity
- **LP20** – Sustainable transport
- **NPPF Paragraphs 130 and 134** – Contextual design and refusal of poor development

It also undermines the integrity of the original approval and sets a dangerous precedent for developer-led intensification without proper scrutiny.

Conclusion

This application should be refused on the grounds of misrepresentation, material deviation, amenity harm, and policy conflict. I request that it be called in to Planning Committee for full public scrutiny.

Yours faithfully,

Please do not make my name or any personal details public.