

Matter 16 - Delivering growth policies (Policies PLP 1,5 &7)

Comments by Holmfirth Conservation Group (HCG)

1. If PLP1 is taken at face value is taken at face value, the majority of development proposals will have to be refused because they will fail on the grounds of not improving the social & environmental conditions in the valley, purely on the basis that the DLP does not address the current problems that persist in the several communities that comprise the Holme Valley.
2. We doubt the ability of Masterplanning (PLP5) by ad hoc developments tp properly & adequately address the needs of our communities.
3. The fact that Holmfirth Conservation Area is identified, by Historic England, as a conservation area “at risk”, would indicate that Kirklees ‘ attitude to its heritage has little or no importance. The Conservation Area Appraisal is being conducted by HCG, initially, without the fulsome backing of Kirklees. Even now their stance can only be described as ambivalent.
4. With regard to Policy PLP7 there is a sign of the lack of joined-up thinking. Development in the valley seldom, if ever, achieves 35 dwellings per hectare. The valley has an abundance of low density housing, but a lack of housing to meet the needs of local young people wishing to remain living in the valley; which is most evidently needed.
5. There is also a failure to acknowledge the role played by old textile mills accommodating many small and emerging companies. In fact, one of the housing proposals involves the demolition of one of these very mills (Bridge Mills). No thought has been given as to where the displaced

companies will go. This is the an example of the inadequacy of logical thinking.

6. The growth of more low density housing to serve the employment needs of centres outside the valley will only put greater strain on the existing over-crowded transportation network, particularly to Huddersfield.

Submission date:16th November 2017