

DC Admin

From:
Sent: 21 July 2026 11:38
To: Katie Chew
Cc: DC Admin
Subject: Objection to Planning Application 2026/91657

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

Good morning, Ms Chew,

I formally object to this application. The submitted drawings do not present a single, coherent version of the proposed development. There is a material conflict between the footprint shown on the Site Plan and that shown on the Grouped Plans and Elevations. Furthermore, the development under construction does not correspond with the smaller footprint depicted on the Site Plan.

Consequently, the application understates the development's true scale and proximity to my property and does not provide a reliable basis upon which its effects can properly be assessed.

1. Materially inconsistent application drawings

The overall footprint of the house and garage shown on the Site Plan is approximately 7% smaller than the corresponding footprint shown on the Grouped Plans and Elevations. These drawings cannot both accurately represent the same proposed development.

This is not an insignificant drafting discrepancy. The Site Plan is intended to show the development's scale and position in relation to the site boundaries, adjoining development and nearby properties. Depicting a smaller building on that plan understates both its proximity to my property and its apparent mass within the plot.

Kirklees Council's validation requirements state that a site layout or block plan must:

- be provided at an identified metric scale;
- show the proposed development in relation to site boundaries, adjoining properties and the immediate area; and
- accurately depict the development being proposed.

The general requirements also state that electronically submitted plans must be uploaded at the scale indicated and include a linear scale bar.

In its present form, the application does not enable the Council or members of the public to identify with certainty the dimensions, footprint and precise siting of the development for which permission is sought.

2. The Site Plan does not represent the development under construction

Construction has already progressed to ground-floor level. Physical measurements indicate that the structure being built corresponds with the larger footprint shown on the Grouped Plans and Elevations, rather than the smaller footprint depicted on the Site Plan.

The discrepancy therefore has a direct physical consequence. The Site Plan does not accurately represent the development under construction and understates its relationship with the relevant site boundary and my property opposite.

This is particularly important because the application concerns development that is already substantially under construction. The Council should assess the building that is actually being constructed, using verified measurements, rather than relying upon a Site Plan that depicts a materially smaller building.

3. Harm to residential amenity

The larger footprint brings the building materially closer to the boundary facing my property than the Site Plan suggests. Its effects must therefore be assessed using the larger, as-built dimensions and its actual position on the site.

The increased width, substantial vertical massing and proximity of the development would produce a visually dominant and overbearing form when viewed from my property. The larger building envelope also increases the potential loss of light and outlook beyond that suggested by the smaller footprint shown on the Site Plan.

These effects must be considered cumulatively, taking account of the building's actual footprint, siting, height, levels and number of storeys. They cannot properly be assessed by reference to the smaller and materially misleading representation contained in the Site Plan.

Conclusion

The Council should not determine this application on the basis of the present contradictory drawing set. The applicant should first be required to provide:

1. a single, coordinated set of correctly scaled and dimensioned drawings;
2. an accurate measured as-built survey showing the footprint and its distances from the site boundaries;
3. verified finished-floor, eaves and ridge levels tied to a fixed Ordnance Datum; and
4. clear confirmation of which drawings represent the development for which permission is being sought.

If materially corrected drawings are submitted, neighbouring residents should be given a proper opportunity to comment upon them.

Unless and until these discrepancies are resolved, the Council cannot reliably identify or assess the development before it. If the application is determined as presently submitted, I request that it be refused because the proposal has not been accurately or consistently described and because its actual scale, massing and proximity would cause unacceptable harm to the residential amenity of my property.

Please do not make my personal details public.

Kind regards