

Dear Sirs,

Objection to Planning and Listed Building Consent Applications, Nos. 2018/92347 and 2018/92348

Partial demolition and change of use of ground and lower ground floors to offices and external alterations.

92 New North Road, Edgerton, Huddersfield

I wish to object to the Applications described above in my capacity as owner of the
, as the proposal will affect the enjoyment of my property directly.

On receipt of the notification my partner and I were deeply upset and astonished at the lack of empathy shown by the applicant regarding the effect this proposal will have on us as adjacent property owners, and on all other residents in the immediate area. When we bought our property, we did so in the knowledge that the location enjoyed Conservation Area status and that No. was a GII Listed Building. It was, we thought, reasonable to assume that we could live without fear of significant detrimental change. This proposal would however see this all destroyed and our general happiness affected. Our social areas; lounge, conservatory and patio would be impacted by the car park and the added footfall that would come with the business, and it would appear that users of the proposed car park will be able to see directly into our lounge and bedrooms. My objection therefore is on multiple grounds.

Below are many specific points that I believe show the dramatic effect this proposal will have on our living situation and I plead with the decision maker to put themselves in our shoes and ask would you want to live under these conditions?

Privacy

- The staff car park would allow direct views into lounge and bedrooms at the rear of our property. The hours of opening are not yet identified within the proposal but even nine to five opening hours would impede on our privacy as my partner is a student and I work from home Weds/Fri. The proposal would see many people coming in and out of the carpark all who would directly be able to see into our living spaces.
- Land to the rear of is presently open in the manner of a courtyard. Our conservatory looks onto this space, and it also comprises our outdoor amenity area. I appreciate that we occupy our own Planning Unit, however this definition in Planning terms

will not protect us from overlooking. The submitted plan shown removal of existing garages and replacement with parking spaces marked 'Staff Car Parking'. The impact of the proposed open parking area upon our conservatory and amenity space will be a continual procession of individuals looking in as they walk from the car parking area to the rear of No. 92, to the detriment of our residential amenity and to the detriment of occupiers of which also currently enjoys use of this area as amenity space.

- We bought this property because of the secluded area and the quietness/peacefulness that came with it. This will be greatly affected again by the proposal. I do appreciate that things change and that despite its Conservation Area status, the immediate locality will be subject to development pressures. I must point out however that nowhere in your Draft Local Plan do I see a Policy that encourages introduction of office uses into established residential areas. This will be for a multitude of reasons, one of which will be the potential impact upon the residential amenity of existing residents.
- Looking outside of the commercial property even the added number of residential tenants who will access their property through the back courtyard will have a great effect on our privacy. The four flats whose access will be moved to back double the number of residents who currently use the area. This will have an effect 24/7.
- The property is low level and the second bedroom located on the drive between the two properties is clearly visible through the window and would mean we are unable to open curtains or windows. Currently this is not an issue as there is limited amount of people using the drive so our privacy is not greatly affected.
- There is also no way of separating the two properties and this may lead to the public straying onto our land. Again, I refer to the fact that are separate Planning Units, however there is no physical break between the two at the rear due to the courtyard layout and the fact that No. 92 is Listed. Construction of a formal boundary fence would not only be impractical in terms of access, but would have a detrimental impact upon the setting of this Listed Building.

Safety & Security

- Increasing the number of people in the area means an increased risk of damage and theft to our property and cars. The property has low level access to large windows and currently its main protection from theft and burglary is that it is hidden away and unseen by the public. I fear that increased public use will highlight the security issue and increase the risk that someone sees a potential opportunity for theft.
- Currently we are aware of the small number of people who reside in this area, making it easy to identify strangers and potential threats to ourselves and our property. By allowing public access to the area I again see and increased risk to our property.
-

- The description states 'Office' which could mean A2 or B1. This needs to be clarified as each Use Class brings with it potential for differing occupiers with vastly different needs in terms of service provision and potential for disturbance to neighbours. I am most concerned also about the potential of an A2 use, given the subsequent ability to change to retail without expressed planning consent.
- The Layout suggests a medical or similar 'health-related' use, which is contrary to the description as 'Office'. If the intended user is to be a D1 use, again this brings its own particular set of requirements and problems within an established residential area.
- If the end user is to be D1, we are being misled about what kind business will be conducted in the property. A D1 use will increase risk to resident's security and safety and is not something that we feel is not appropriate for an enclosed residential area.
- The above could all be countered by CCTV but this would then impede on our privacy and would not be deemed acceptable.

Access, Visual Appearance and Practicality of the Car Park

- First and foremost, the plans outlined for the carpark are not accurate. The spaces lined out for visitor parking will not be accessible as there is not ample space to pull a car into each spot. There is also not enough space for 7 car parking spaces where the garages lie, as the proposed area encroaches onto the land owned . There is also not enough space at the side of the building which is proposed for one flat space and one coach house space, only one car could fit in this area and that would be assuming the current waste disposal bins where to move (not shown on this plan) as they currently sit within this spot. The proposed parking layout, although difficult to scale accurately, appears to contain 2.5 x 5.0m parking spaces. Whilst spaces of this size were considered acceptable under the old West Yorkshire Design Guide and other Development Control publications, it is generally understood that such spaces are impractical for contemporary use given the higher proportion of large vehicles on the road today. You will assess this proposal against Draft Local Plan parking requirements, and find that whilst the number of spaces indicated appears satisfactory, the actual number of useable spaces is not.
- The changes that have been proposed, will greatly impact the visual aesthetics of the area and make it less appealing for the residents. We do not want to look out over a car park.
- The plan does also not allow for manoeuvrability as the area is tighter than appears on the plans. Given that we share access through the courtyard, we would struggle to pull our vehicles past the cars parked centrally within the car park to leave the area. The reality of the situation is that sub-standard car parking provision leads to haphazard parking practices, and our access is likely to be impeded as a result.
- Due to the council's proposal to prevent road parking the residents form New North Road will all need rear parking, as well as the increased commercial parking therefore there is not ample room for the proposed spaces.

- As is human nature, if the members of the public feel there is no other alternative but to park on our residential space, then this will happen. I feel that the only way to counter act this would be to clearly mark the area but there is no way we are vandalising our own property to ensure we can park outside our own house. We also risk being blocked in by the public who may feel they are only there for a quick visit but this may crucially impede on our ability to leave our property.
- I would like to know how these spaces within the proposal would be visualised, as any car park markings would destroy the aesthetics of the rear of our property, turning what is now a social space into a commercial car park.
- Access of the emergency services would be vitally impeded, as the fire and ambulance service would not have sufficient room to access our property. The car park is directly between our only entrance/exit point to our property and the courtyard entrance meaning there is insufficient room for these vehicles to pass.
- Our shared access is secured by Easement, and any reduction in accessibility as a direct result of the proposal would be in breach, with potential legal consequences. The Application does not appear to address this possibility.

Maintenance & Cleanliness

- Currently the area is clean and of sufficient living standard. It is this way because of the care taken by the residents who are proud of the area we live in. A commercial company and the public will not have the same concern about waste and litter.
- The maintenance of the area is also an issue, increased traffic will cause damage to the surface of the carpark, the company in charge will no doubt not want to pay out large sums to upkeep the area.
- Noise pollution will also increase, leading to EPA conflict. As LPA, you will be conscious of your cross-Departmental responsibilities in this respect.

Financial

- We purchased a property that was part of a secluded residential area, which was perfect for a professional couple who wanted a small place accessible to the motorway and Huddersfield town centre. Whilst we are aware that the Planning process does not consider property value, the proposal is likely to cause the value of our and other nearby property to decrease. The impact of this is that large, detached dwellings such as ours are more likely to be sold off for flats and HMO's in the future, with less owner 'pride' and a gradual decline in the character of the Conservation Area.
- As part of our objection I will attain current and post-development valuations of inform the Developer of the difference and seek legal advice.

Disruption from construction

- All the points above cover the long-term effects the proposal will have upon our lives but there are also the short-term effects due to the construction to take into consideration. The demolition of the back of the building is directly in front of the access to our properties. For a certain amount of time we will be unable to access the courtyard due to the work and we will also be looking out onto what will be a building site. The added disruption of noise and constant deliveries will affect our lifestyle.

Conclusion

The impact of the proposed development will be of direct detriment to the residential amenity of occupants of _____, as described above. I anticipate that the occupant of _____ will be objecting also. The proposed development will be of detriment to the character of the Conservation Area also, and potentially to the historic setting of a Grade II Listed Building (the host property). The submitted Heritage Statement does not take adequate account of these issues, nor does the Application description explain the Use Class. As it stands therefore, irrespective of the Decision, both Applications are flawed and should be returned as invalid pending additional information.

I ask respectfully that you take all my points into consideration, and do not grant planning permission for this conflicting use.

Yours Faithfully