

**Sent:** 26 January 2026 19:03  
**To:** DC Admin  
**Subject:** Objection to 2025/93480 Development  
**Attachments:** Broken Fence.jpg; Footpath.jpg

Dear Planning Officer,

I wish to formally object to the above planning application for 28 dwellings and to raise the following concerns, which I do not believe have been adequately addressed.

### **1. Access, Parking and Traffic During the Construction Period**

I am extremely concerned about the impact of construction traffic on the existing residential estate. The estate roads are narrow and were not designed to accommodate heavy goods vehicles, plant machinery, delivery lorries, or the additional volume of contractors' vehicles that this development would generate.

In relation to notification of the application, I understand that four site notices have been displayed across the estate. Given the incorrect information on your planning website, which misled local residents by stating that the consultation had ended on the 13.01.2026, I do not believe that affected residents have been fully consulted and in fact there are glaring omissions. Notably, no notices are displayed on Thorpe Green Drive, despite this road being directly affected by increased traffic, parking pressure, and construction activity. Residents on Thorpe Green Drive will be impacted to the same extent as those within the immediate estate. This raises serious concerns as to whether all affected residents were properly notified and given a fair opportunity to comment within the 21-day consultation period.

The estate roads are unsuitable for the anticipated volume and weight of construction traffic. Particularly, Thorpe Green Drive, Weavers Avenue, Weavers lane and Graham Shaw Way. Clarification is required as to who will be responsible for any damage to road surfaces and associated infrastructure caused by construction vehicles—Kirklees Council or the developer.

Refuse collection is already problematic. Over the Christmas period, bin collections were missed because refuse vehicles refused to access the street due to a single parked car (a standard-sized VW Polo) being deemed a hazard. If refuse vehicles will not enter the street under existing conditions, it is difficult to see how collections will continue reliably when construction vehicles, plant, or delivery wagons are present. I therefore request confirmation of how uninterrupted refuse collection will be guaranteed throughout the construction phase.

Road cleanliness is a further concern. Construction activity will inevitably result in mud and debris being deposited on surrounding roads. I request clarification as to whether a condition will be imposed requiring regular, ideally daily, road cleaning to prevent ongoing nuisance and safety hazards for residents.

Parking remains a significant and unresolved issue. There is virtually no on-street parking within the estate, aside from a very limited number of visitor spaces. This will inevitably displace construction workers' vehicles onto surrounding roads, including the streets mentioned above. While it may be suggested that all parking will be contained within the site, based on over 30 years' experience working on construction sites, this is rarely enforced in practice. Trades and contractors are commonly prohibited from parking within active sites, regardless of stated intentions. I therefore ask how parking will be realistically managed and, crucially, how this will be enforced, and by whom—Kirklees Council or the site operator.

## **2. Existing Communal Area, Management Fees and Proposed Connecting Path**

I have attached two photographs: one showing the existing fence line between the estate and the proposed development site, which has been deliberately damaged at some point to create an informal walk-through, and another showing what appears to be a potential extension of the existing communal path connecting to the new estate. The land within the proposed site is used daily by local residents for dog walking and general access. In reality, this use constitutes trespass, as the land is private and the original fence line has been vandalised. The communal area is managed by a management company, Gateway, to which all residents pay an annual fee for maintenance, and the path is not a legal right of way or bridleway.

Having reviewed the submitted drawings, it appears that a connection from the existing communal path to the new estate is being proposed. I seek clarification as to how this is possible, given that the developer does not own this land and has no apparent legal right to construct or formalise a path across property that is privately owned and managed by a third-party management company.

Furthermore, if such a path were to be created and used by residents of the new development, has any discussion taken place regarding a reduction in existing residents' management fees? If not, it is unclear why current residents should be legally required to continue paying for the upkeep of land that would then be used by residents of a separate development.

Given the cumulative impact of inadequate consultation, unsuitable access arrangements, parking pressures, and the likely disruption to essential services, I respectfully request that these matters are fully addressed before any consideration is given to approving this application.

2025/93480

Photo 1 of 2  
Broken Fence



Photo 2 of 2  
Footpath

