Kirklees COUNCIL

Consultation Response from: KC Environmental Health (Pollution & Noise Control)		
2019/90988 - Land adj, lock 38, Marsden Lane, Marsden, Huddersfield, HD7 6AF		
Use of land for provision of camping facilities, formation of camper van and tent sites, erection of 5 camping pods, toilet block and wood store and associated works		
Date Responded: **10 Jan 2020**	**Responding Officer:** **Richard Hume**	**Responding Ref:** **WK/201907193**

In our previous response we commented on our concerns regarding the potential of smoke from camp fires at the site and noise from the users of the site both causing a loss of amenity to neighbouring properties. We also commented on our concerns regarding what appeared to be inadequate proposals for foul drainage at the site. We recommended that in the absence of these issues being resolved the application should be refused.

Additional information has now been received in an email from William Best dated 24 Dec 2019 and a revised Proposed Site Plan" by William Best dated March 2019 (ref: 2018-541-03 5 C).

The email advises that the camp fire area and tent camping have been omitted from the amended plan. He also advises that the accommodation has been relocated further north and that a connection to the sewer network would be made. He also refers to the rules covering noise in the Design & Access Statement.

The comments regarding removal of the camp fire area is noted. With a condition to prevent open burning on the site our concerns regarding smoke can now be addressed.

The concerns regarding foul drainage provision remain. There is no detailed information regarding how access to the sewer network will be gained, and if that is the intention it raises the question why are the composting toilets being retained. Relocating the camping pods to the North West boundary of the site actually moves them further away from an accessible foul sewer network than they were in the previous plan. The removal of the tents from the plan is of no great significance regarding drainage if there is to be a connection to the mains drainage system.

The rules covering noise appear to be unchanged, therefore our previous concerns and comments remain relevant.

Recommendations

The concerns regarding smoke can now be addressed through a condition but there continues to be insufficient information to demonstrate that adequate foul drainage facilities are feasible and the there is still no effective proposals for preventing excessive noise from users of the site. In the absence of these I would again recommend that the application should be refused.