

Dear Sir or Madam

Please accept the objection below to Planning Application No. 2025/62/92181/E

We regard the revised planning application at 382 Huddersfield Road, Mirfield as essentially no different from the previous one. We therefore make the same objections as before, which I set out below for your convenient reference.

In addition, since the title of the planning application and the accompanying plans emphasize the proposed vertical extension, We object to any increase in height. This would make the new structure overbearing and it would make the adjoining public right of way from Huddersfield Road/Back Lane to Stocksbank Road oppressive. It would also interfere with light for Nos. 376, 378 and 380, Huddersfield Road.

Previous objections

The building in the planning application is out of character with the area and the original building. Regarding substantial excavations at the rear, the new building's appearance, height of roof and dormers including materials such as breeze blocks on the property side and back, would make it an eyesore.

The traditional stone wall has not been retained next to the footpath at the eastern side. It has already been replaced by an overbearing structure which reduces daylight.

Inadequate and unsuitable bin storage would further detract from the appearance and proposed operation of the premises.

Noise at the hours proposed would adversely affect the neighbourhood.

The application is unclear about the type of shop proposed and its specific functions.

There is no provision for on-site parking by customers, staff and deliveries. The original shop operated some seventy years ago when traffic was much lighter.

The proposed shop is off Huddersfield Road and access is poor due to the road layout.

The stipulated access on the plan does not include access at the rear of the property where a wall/fence has already been constructed, a gap has been left in the wall/fence to which I object for use as access as this is not covered by the planning application.

I object to the proposed development for the reasons above and because the development would have a deleterious effect on the local area. The work already carried out has been done without adequate consultation with interested parties and consideration for local people and footpath users.