

Hannah Halstead

From: Nigel Hunston
Sent: 29 August 2017 12:29
To: DCAdmin
Subject: 2017/92568 at location Land off Woodhead Road, Honley, Holmfirth

I am aware that outline planning consent was granted in April 2015 with all matters reserved apart from access.

Due to the levels and other constraints this is a very difficult site to develop and as such creates a number of issues that need to be overcome. These comments will firstly look at the layout and provide general comments then proceed to point to the details.

Layout

The land steeply slopes down from Woodhead Road in a north eastern direction with a secondary access road turning south east, parallel to Woodhead Road. A public footpath runs in a north west to south east direction and cuts through the site close to the entrance. The road continues down the slope before terminating at a hammer head (indicated to allow future access); there is a secondary access road before the hammerhead that turns east before turning back upon itself up the slope. Due to the level differences the site uses retaining walls and split level housing as well as stepping in the roof line.

Plots 1-5 are gable ended onto Woodhead Road and are parallel to the new main access into the site; due to the level differences the first floor level is just above the level of Woodhead Road. It is therefore important that Plot 1 is so designed to offer interest and activity onto Woodhead Road rather than presenting a blank gable. Equally boundary treatments will be important to ensure that there is a level of security, bearing in mind the topography but ensuring that the amenity of Woodhead Road is maintained. Upon entering the access road there is a secondary access to the south east which is extremely long and linear with little interest provided. The dwellings are close together, separated by steps to the rear, with car parking to the front. Those dwellings to the south west have their rear gardens backing onto Woodhead Road with their first floor level with the main road. There are significant land level issues here which compromises the amenity of those dwellings, equally their rear garden spaces are tight especially plots 6, 7 and 23. In particular plot 23 is very small and compromised by existing trees which may cause nuisance issues in the future. By being rear facing there is a need for boundary treatment but this should not be harsh treatment and will need to be softened by landscaping. Due to the linear nature of this secondary access road and the amount of front off street parking there is a need to break this up by adequate landscaping as there is a danger that it will become a sea of tarmac with little interest provided.

To the side of plots 5 and 41 and the rear of plot 36 to 40 runs the public footpath. Due to the topography of the site the footpath has to run under the access road through a tunnel/subway. This is not ideal and could be an issue of security especially when you leave the tunnel you are faced with an open tunnel due to the necessity of a retaining wall. The land is graded down to the rear of 36-40 but there is no information on the type of boundary fence here which may well be 2 metres in height. When combined with the retaining wall (approx. 2.5m in height) this will lead to a very confined space and not one person will feel comfortable in using. I would suggest that the comments of the Police Architectural Liaison Officer and the PROW officer are sought.

Plot 48 is parallel to the main access road and is gable end onto it. There are no details for the boundary treatment and this needs to be carefully considered here especially as any treatment is shown to be back of pavement.

Plot 69 has two visitor parking spaces in its front garden which do not appear protected by planting.

Plot 49 is accessed off the hammer head and would be awkward to do so as shown.

Details

- There are no details given for boundary treatment which are adequately understood from the plans
- No Planting is shown that would help break up the site and help legibility.

- Type A dwelling has blank gables and this is not appropriate
- No dwellings should have blank gables to the road side or to the POS

Conclusion

I feel further work is necessary here to help achieve a satisfactory layout.

Nigel Hunston
Group Leader (Conservation and Design)
Investment and Regeneration Services
PO Box B93
Civic Centre 3
Huddersfield
HD1 2JR

Tel: 01484 221000
Internal: 860 2924
Short Code 04254
Lync code: 74217