DC Admin

From:
Sent: 26 July 2026 09:44
To: Katie Chew
Cc: DC Admin
Subject: Objection to Planning Application 2026/91657 – Plot 23, Lingards Road - Removed only on paper

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,

Please find below a comment regarding planning application 2026/91657.

The Larger Bespoke Design Was Removed on Paper but Apparently Preserved in Construction

The applicant's 2024 supporting statement establishes that the double garage, enlarged kitchen beneath it and usable basement were conceived as parts of one bespoke design intended to meet the buyer's requirements and secure the sale.

The arrangement also offered clear financial advantages. It created additional valuable domestic floorspace while avoiding the cost of backfilling the excavated space beneath the garage.

Council records show that the double garage subsequently raised concerns about overdevelopment. It was removed from the proposal and replaced by the single garage that ultimately received permission. The enlarged accommodation associated with it was also omitted from the approved scheme.

However, the subsequent construction suggests that the commercially preferred design was not abandoned. Foundations and lower structural works capable of accommodating the larger arrangement were constructed, while SK15 "Option 1" records that a coordinated alternative design existed before those works began. The principal contractor later confirmed that the foundations had been constructed from plans, although Kirklees has yet to establish which plans were used.

The same elements removed from the earlier proposal have now returned through application 2026/91657.

The central concern can therefore be stated simply:

> **Overdevelopment concerns led to the larger design being removed from the planning scheme on paper, but the subsequent construction suggests that it was never truly abandoned.**

The Council must establish whether the approved single-garage scheme was ever genuinely intended to be built, or whether the larger buyer-led design continued to guide the construction while its constituent parts were presented for approval "one application at a time".

Application 2026/91657 must be assessed against the approved single-garage scheme—not against the larger structure subsequently established on the ground. It should not be permitted to legitimise a design previously removed following concerns about overdevelopment.

Please do not make my personal details public.

Kind regards