

Sent: 03 June 2026 14:04

Subject: Planning Application 2025/44/92737/E and 2025/61/92713/E Objection

Good Morning

I note that we now have the following Consultation Response from: KC Environmental Health (Pollution & Noise Control) 2025/92737 - rear of, 23 to 43, Moor Lane, Gomersal, Cleckheaton, BD19 4LF

Date Responded: Responding Officer: Responding Ref: Wednesday, 27 May 2026 HK WK/202533227

Reference is made to the discharge of reserved matters one of which being no.24 (acoustic barrier). They have commented as follows:-

“Based on the information presented in the submitted drawing Ref: 21942-10 Access Road Elevations, dated July 2023, the proposed acoustic barrier could only achieve noise reductions at ground floor level. Noise from road traffic accessing the site will not be reduced by the installation of a noise barrier at first floor (bedroom window height). Noise reductions at first floor level could only be achieved by installing acoustic glazing – as can be seen in the drawing Ref: 21942-10, Access Road Elevations, dated July 2023”.

I welcome this comment from KC Environmental Health but would question the length of time that it has taken for this matter to be addressed, since I first raised it in a Neighbour Representation back in 2023.

What I did find incredulous at the time was the specification for the acoustic screen. This was to replace the existing Waney Lap timber fence with an acoustic timber fence, comprising 15mm x 19mm pailings with a minimum 25mm overlap on timber rails, to offer a **5 decibel noise reduction**. This was below the window cills on the ground floor of 25 Moor Lane, which is of brick and block construction, but no thought was given to providing any form of additional sound insulation to the 3 windows directly above.

To put this into context, and in simple terms, a 5 decibel noise reduction would only reduce the sound level of a Diesel Truck passing the property from **84 dB to 79 dB**.

My research shows that to provide any significant sound reduction this can only be made with a specialised acoustic fence installation which would then achieve a reduction of 20 to 32 dB under optimal conditions. Also, as pointed out by K C officers, acoustic glazing would need to be addressed.

Once again we have another “ Reserved Matters “ issue inherited by the new developers which could be difficult to resolve.

It is my opinion that a new Planning Application should have been submitted by PPJ in the first place, as some of what they inherited is proving unworkable.

Please list this communication as an Objection on both planning applications named above.