

DC Admin

From:
Sent: 16 April 2026 00:29
To: DC Admin
Subject: Formal objection - Planning application 2026/90937

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

Dear Katie Chew,

Re: Planning Application 2026/90937 – Gomersal St Mary’s CE Primary School

I write to formally object to the above application on the grounds of its impact on neighbouring residential amenity.

While I support the principle of improving school facilities, I have significant concerns regarding the scale, siting, and use of the proposed building, particularly in relation to its proximity to neighbouring properties.

The submitted elevations confirm that the building reaches approximately 8.334 metres in height, which is substantial despite being described as “single storey”. Positioned close to the eastern boundary, this results in a large and continuous built form directly adjacent to residential properties. In my view, this creates an overbearing and visually dominant structure, resulting in a material loss of outlook and an increased sense of enclosure when viewed from neighbouring gardens.

This impact is exacerbated by the orientation of surrounding properties. Neighbouring gardens are south-west facing, meaning they currently benefit from afternoon and evening sunlight. The scale and positioning of the proposed building create a clear risk of increased overshadowing during these key periods, reducing the usability and enjoyment of these outdoor spaces. Notably, the application does not include a detailed daylight or shadow assessment to demonstrate that this impact has been adequately considered.

In addition, the building will house a sports hall and main assembly space, which are likely to generate significant levels of activity noise. The submitted noise assessment appears to focus primarily on plant equipment and external areas but does not adequately assess noise breakout from internal uses, such as sports activities, assemblies, or potential community use. This represents a significant omission, particularly given the proximity of residential properties.

Furthermore, there is inconsistency within the application documents. While the noise report suggests limited out-of-hours use, other documents indicate that the facilities may be used more broadly, including potentially at weekends. This raises concern that the true operational impact has not been fully assessed.

The Construction Environmental Management Plan also identifies noise impacts on neighbouring residents as high, with properties located within approximately 20–44 metres of the works. While

construction impacts may be temporary, they further underline the sensitivity of the site and the need for careful consideration of residential amenity.

Overall, while I support the principle of redevelopment, I do not consider that the current proposal adequately mitigates its impact on neighbouring properties in terms of scale, light, and noise. I therefore respectfully request that the application is either revised to reduce these impacts or that appropriate conditions and further assessments are secured to address these concerns.

Yours faithfully,

34 Shirley Avenue
Gomersal