

From:
Sent: 17 February 2026 12:48
To: louise.bearcroft@kirklees.co.uk; DC Admin
Subject: Objection to Planning Application 2025/92737 and 2025/92713

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

Ms Bearcroft
Subject Planning Applications:
2025/61/92713/E

Comments / Concerns re the Latest Revised Plans

Revised plans were submitted by the new developers PPJ Developments on the 26th September 2025 for Approval of Reserved Matters following Outline Approval granted on the 5th December 2023 (SECTION 106 OUTLINE PERMISSION)
These revised plans differed greatly from the original plans submitted by Binks Developments in September 2023 resulting in numerous objections and comments during the Public consultation period which ended in December 2025.

We now have further amended plans submitted on the 4th and 13th February 2026 which I would have thought would reflect some of the concerns raised.
Unfortunately very little has changed and these are still not in line with the original outline approval for a number of reasons.

Originally 6 No 3 Bed and 4 No 4 Bed houses were planned for, and approved.
The latest plans show 6 No 3 Bed, 2 No 4 Bed and 2 No 5 Bed Houses along with attached Garages to 9 of these properties.
Also additional Bedrooms or Office accommodation is being provided above these garages.
Plot 1 is also shown as a 3 storey house rather than the 2 storey house indicated on the approved plans.
Also the distance between each of the properties appears to be between 900mm and 1.00 metre and bears no relationship to the outline application.
Bearing in mind the Councils earlier decision on the 23rd June 2023 to refuse permission on the basis of the development proposal **being cramped and invasive**, this issue has not been addressed.

“In accordance with the plan(s) and applications submitted to the Council on 23-Jun-2022. The reasons for the Council’s decision to refuse permission for the development are:

1. The proposed development, by reason of the number of dwellings and subsequent layout would result in a cramped and intensive form of development on the existing green space which would be out of keeping with the character of the area. To approve the proposed development would be contrary to Policy LP24(a) of the Kirklees Local Plan and Chapter 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework.”

Based on this alone, surely the application 2025/92713 should be refused.

Travel distances for wheeling refuse bins still appear to exceed permitted travel distances.

Plot 3 Bin store route appears to be down the foot path belonging to Plot 4.

The Flood exceedance route is still shown routed into the private garden of 21 Summerdale, which from my research is illegal, unless permission is granted by the owner. Not only is this of major concern to them, but also other residents of Summerdale.

The 2 parking spaces for 27 Moor Lane will have to be accessed off the private block driveway of Plot 2 and seems illogical.

Also 2 visitor car parking spaces are in an equally ridiculous position, and again these are off the private block drive serving plots 7, 8, 9 and 10, which will no doubt be used by the house occupants.

There are still no “Communal Enhanced Habit Zones “ indicated on the latest plans. Originally 3 separate areas were proposed, one adjacent Plot 1, a second adjacent Plots 2 and 3, and a third adjacent Plots 5 and 6 totalling 465m²

Outline planning permission was granted based on having these areas as per the following approved application 2023/60/92079/E - Drawing No 21942

Plot 10 is shown as being 8.876 metres away from No 21 Summerdale measured at an angle towards their property. However, they have not shown the conservatory that is only a metre or so away from the boundary.

A measurement of 15.109 metres is shown to No 23 Summerdale which is totally irrelevant and has no bearing on the issue.

The fact of the matter is that the North East gable of Plot 10 will be only metres away from the boundary and will also be approximately 2.00 metres higher than the Ridge of 21 Summerdale.

The building of the house in such close proximity to No 21 Summerdale will be oppressive and seriously affect their daylight.

I often walk up Moor Lane and regularly see cars having to stop and give way in the vicinity of the access to the site. I can see that despite best attempts the sight lines do not work.

The main problem is that vehicles coming up Moor Lane are not on the left hand side of the road, but straddling the centre line, or worse right over to the right. As such some vehicles cannot be seen until they are 10 to 15 metres from the entrance.

Furthermore the actual kerbs have still to be finished in the vicinity of the boundary of No 29, and it appears to me that the sight line will need to extend over their boundary and garden to fulfil the requirement.

The new developer appears to have totally ignored the approved outline application and with the considerable changes to the House types, Garages and omission of Communal areas, I would have thought that a new planning application should be made.

Please log the above comments / objection against the case files for both planning applications 2025/92737 and 2025/92713

Regards

9 Summerdale, Gomersal