

To: DCAdmin
Subject: Further objection comments to application 2018/92686

OBJECTION TO PLANNING APPLICATION NUMBER 2018/92686
LAND ADJ, 127, WESTGATE, HECKMONDWIKE, WF16 0EW
RETAIL UNIT, DRIVE THRU RESTAURANT DEVELOPMENT, CAR PARK, LANDSCAPING AND
INFRASTRUCTURE

To whom it may concern

I further object to the plans outlined in the above application on the following further grounds:

APPLICATION FORM

This states that they have not started work when they have already removed some trees.

It also states that it is unknown how they will deal with foul sewage or whether they will connect to a current drainage system. How are either of these an acceptable

answer?

There is no plan for the storage and to aid the collection of waste which borders on the ridiculous for a plan incorporating a fast food outlet.

There is no plan for recyclable waste. Is this not an environmental duty of all businesses?

Nor is there an answer to how surface water would be disposed of.

As for flood risk they measure it at 40m from spen beck but have not measured that at it's nearest point.

of bats, numerous neighbours report the presence
hedgehogs etc etc. numerous squirrels, foxes,

It recommends that woodland be retained or if not to be then re-assessed during spring. However imposing the plans on top of a google maps satellite view of the site shows the necessity to remove almost all the trees.

They claim it will create 45 full time and 45 part time jobs. Based on current retail sustainability (and regardless of any Brexit aftermath) how can this possibly be known? Also the claim that since Heckmondwike is a higher than average area of unemployment it will provide much needed employment for Heckmondwike residents. This cannot possibly be known. They do not know whether there are suitable candidates for any jobs. Most stores promote managers and assistant managers from within or attract applications for such from within so the likeliest candidates for those positions are already employed. Similarly people who live in Heckmondwike but currently commute out of it to work might think it will make their lives easier to work closer to home so potentially it could be areas like Huddersfield or Dewsbury which actually benefit from these jobs being created since jobs that were taken there suddenly become vacant.

Their own Design and Access statement admits the proximity of residential properties but does not admit they are proposing to put car parking almost on top of

those properties. In fact in many cases where the rear garden walls are low and because the site is elevated above those gardens people on the site will be looking over into Boundary Street residents gardens.

What would happen to the units or even the site if they/it is not financially viable? Heckmondwike cannot sustain the shops it has. They close regularly to be replaced more often than not by hairdressers or fast food outlets.

NOISE ASSESSMENT

Daytime trading periods are listed as 6am to midnight. That is not daytime and nor is it an accurate reflection of operating hours as a fast food outlet needs to not only clean up after business but also prepare for business. So as a bare minimum this could be said to be 5am to 1 or 2pm and even this might not take into account waste collection or delivery times.

Noise from parking specifies number 9 - 21 but on the application plans ALL bungalows have parking bays directly behind them. They are assessing the noises made by a car as a single event not a continuous round the clock slamming of more than one door at once, likely every ten minutes or so nearest to the fast food outlet as most people will park as near as possible to their intended destinations.

Up to 2 deliveries a day to the retail unit and garden centre plus unloading equates to the sound of metal cages and fork lift trucks and does not even mention the constant beep of and announcement of "vehicle reversing".

They are saying the noise will be inaudible in properties but does not take into account the need to open windows/doors in the home or even using gardens to relax in or entertain nor the invasion of privacy which is likely.

They also refer to the need to operate condenser fans and ventilation fans 24 hours a day. Providing inevitable noise. A service yard area directly behind the property at 23 boundary street which will involve HGV's regularly turning and reversing in the direction of that bungalow providing not only noise but an imposing presence in very close proximity to the residents garden and kitchen door. Not to mention the possibility of vehicle malfunction resulting in reversing into the adjacent garden.

They claim that noise is not considered a restraint. Really? Car door after car door slamming, alarms, youths fighting, arguing, shouting, drunk and setting bins on fire and emergency services having to attend.

ALTERNATIVE SITES

They claim Station Lane is located in a more predominantly industrial business area rather than the retail town centre but at the same time admit that it and the proposed site are exactly the same distance from the centre of Heckmondwike. The land they are proposing to use is adjacent to housing and has NO retail history.

B+M could use the building in the centre of Heckmondwike that used to be Woolworths. A Garden Centre does not need to (and many are not) be located close to a town eg Whiteley's which is a fair distance away from even Roberttown. Given the substantial number of fast food outlets in Heckmondwike town centre any new ones are surplus to requirements.

They claim that people will have the option to walk or cycle to the site but we all know how the majority are going to travel there - by car. Even if they were to walk from Morrison's car park then a location on Station Lane would probably be nearer. A location on the site of Harrisons/600 lathes which seems to either be or be coming vacant would certainly be nearer and much more user friendly.

They claim that there is a need to re-allocate the proposed use of the land from housing to retail to meet identified needs but there is no identified need for these retailers. Heckmondwike and every other town in Britain requires more Social Care facilities whether that is permanent or intermediate care homes and this site is absolutely perfect for that need.

They claim it will improve the visual amenity when it certainly will not for the residents of Boundary Street who will likely be looking at HGV's over their back wall, litter in their gardens and goodness knows what extra activities in a largely unpoliced open site. Visitors to the site will invade residents privacy by being able to look over into gardens from an elevated position behind walls which are very low on that side.

As part of their application this proposal claims that Kirklees were not planning to use this site to it's optimal capacity for housing. Surely any plan for housing's primary considerations have to be safety and sustainability. It has to be able to deliver utilities and services to people in those homes, take into account the effect of extra residents on health and education facilities and be able to evacuate all residents at all times as quickly as possible. It does not have to fill any area to overflowing simply because the space is there. Their application falls a very long way short of similar care for those resident alongside it already. It puts them in danger, it subjects them to noise nuisance on a minute by minute basis and, most importantly, it affects their human right to enjoy peacefully their own home