

About the application

Application number: 2026/91912	
What is the application for?:	Removal/variation of conditions 2 and 3 (plans) on previous permission 2023/9296
Address of the site or building:	rear of, 271, Cliffe Lane, Gomersal, Cleckheaton, BD19 4SB
Postcode:	LS11 8PG

User comments

Type of comment: An objection	
Do you wish your comments to be published on the website anonymously?	Yes
My concern with this revised application is the lack of clarity with aspects of the boundary treatments of the development. On the application, I have looked at the block layout plan, id 1148971 which shows details of the different boundaries to the individual properties but there is nothing shown for details of the perimeter treatment of the site . The original similar boundary plan of the previous application: Block lay out id 10785441694-101P Site Plan Layout_A1L_1-500 COLOUR 03.03.25 submitted by the previous developer shows annotations for the north, west and eastern boundaries. These give clear instructions for the retention of trees/hedges. The boundary I am particularly concerned about is the most eastern boundary of the site, where there is a hedge adjoining the adjacent field. In the Keepmoat Design and Access statement, section 3 page 2, the plan shows annotation for the northern and western boundaries "Existing trees to boundaries to be retained" The new application shows no such annotation for the eastern boundary. The previous application, for this eastern boundary, has the following annotation next to the hedge: "existing hedge line to be retained // retaining wall to be added whilst being sympathetic to existing hedge line" This detailed plan can also be seen in Keepmoat Design and Access statements, page 2, Planning History (but not with clear annotation when enlarged). I am hoping that the proposed boundary treatment, next to the eastern perimeter hedge in the new plans, will have the same intention to retain the hedge and the fact that this annotation is not included in the new plans is merely an oversight. Another point regarding the hedge line, which may again be an oversight, is that the new plans on the eastern end show the red boundary line going straight along through the middle of the hedge. The previous plans showed the red boundary line inside the	

the middle of the hedge. The previous plans showed the red boundary line inside the hedge, where a wall/fence would be.

The Design and Access statement section 3 page 7 states:

"Where hedgerows are included within the detailed design, these will be protected and supplemented with new planting where appropriate to ensure the biodiversity value of these features is maximized."

It is understandable that some trimming and tidying, out of nesting season, would be necessary as the hedges have been neglected. That is not the same as getting diggers in to uproot a whole line of trees and then replant saplings. Shelter for all the wild life which inhabit this hedge would be lost.

I am hoping that all the perimeter hedges and trees, where indicated in the original plan, including the hedge at the eastern end of the site, will be protected in the new development.

This important diversity aspect of the original plan was passed by Kirklees Planning. I see no reason for it to be changed.

It would avoid any mistakes happening at the groundworks stage of the development if there was clarification on all the new plans.