

Address: 116, PIERREPONT ROAD, WEST BRIDGFORD, NOTTINGHAM, NG2 5DW

About the application

Application number: 2026/90211	
What is the application for?:	Erection of residential development for 9 dwellings with associated works (withi
Address of the site or building:	West House, Oxford Road, Gomersal, Cleckheaton, BD19 4AU
Postcode:	BD7 1NH

User comments

Type of comment: An objection	
Do you wish your comments to be published on the website anonymously?	No

This objection is submitted in response to the proposed development and sets out clear areas of non compliance with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF 2024) and relevant Local Plan policies. The application documents—Planning Statement, Design & Access Statement, Heritage Statement, and Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) assessments—do not demonstrate that the scheme meets national or local planning requirements.

1. Non Compliance with the NPPF

Failure to Demonstrate Sustainable Development (NPPF paras. 8–14)

The proposal does not deliver balanced economic, social, and environmental benefits. Instead, it introduces visual, contextual, and environmental harm without any proportionate public benefit. This is contrary to the NPPF’s overarching requirement that development enhances the built and natural environment rather than erodes it.

Poor Design Response to Local Character (NPPF paras. 130 & 135)

The application fails to demonstrate high quality design or a contextual response to its surroundings. The proposed scale, massing, roof form, and materials do not reflect or reinforce the prevailing historic character. The development reads as incongruous within the established streetscape and does not meet the requirement for design that is sympathetic to local character.

2. Harm to Heritage Assets

Insufficient Heritage Assessment

The Heritage Statement does not provide an adequately detailed assessment of the significance of nearby heritage assets, nor the contribution of their setting. Key views, approaches, and the historic spatial context are either overlooked or insufficiently assessed. The lack of rigorous evidence fails the NPPF requirement for proportionate but thorough assessment of heritage impact.

Less than Substantial Harm Not Justified

The proposal would result in clear less than substantial harm by disrupting key views, settings, and the historic character that contribute to nearby heritage assets’ significance. Its scale, form, and materials are contextually inappropriate, and no meaningful public benefits are evidenced to outweigh this impact. As such, the proposal does not meet the NPPF tests for permitting heritage harm.

3. Deficiencies in Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) Assessments

Inadequate Baseline Information

The baseline habitat assessments are not sufficiently evidenced, and the methodology for classifying habitats lacks clarity. This undermines the validity of the BNG calculation.

Failure to Demonstrate a Deliverable 10% Net Gain

The application does not credibly show how the statutory 10% BNG requirement (Environment Act 2021; NPPF para. 186) will be achieved. Long term management is unclear, and off site measures—if intended—are not secured or appropriately evidenced.

Local Plan Conflicts

The proposal conflicts with Local Plan policies on heritage protection, high quality design, and biodiversity enhancement. The current submission does not demonstrate compliance with these core requirements or provide measures capable of resolving the identified harms and should therefore be refused.