

To:
Subject: Fw: Rear of, 71, Prospect Road, Longwood, Huddersfield, HD3 4UY Erection of 5 dwellings. Planning objection
Date: 24 February 2020 13:51:17

Fao: EMMA THOMPSON

Rear of, 71, Prospect Road, Longwood, Huddersfield, HD3 4UY
Erection of 5 dwellings

2019/91802

My comments:

This planning application is being objected against for the following reasons.

The previous objections still stand, although some of these have been addressed I have included them for reference.

Further to the comments from Kirklees Highways I would like to add that currently the refuge vehicles struggle to get to the rear properties of Prospect Road as soon as there are parked cars (which is normal) hindering the access. This development will cause more of this so it will be interesting to see how the developer proposes to mitigate for this. Also Highways were called out to evidence the degree of traffic and parked vehicles but they came in the daytime when the majority's vehicles have moved. So the evenings and mornings are very different. We also have concerns about flooding to our basements as the new development will create a significant amount of rainwater no longer being soaked away and instead relying on the drainage system (which in instances these days is underdesigned and isn't fit for purpose). This water will also cause issues to the properties down below at the lower side of the development. How does the developer propose to make this road to highway standards in order for it to be adopted and also have the required amount of parking spaces for each property. It is our understanding that we can not rely on street parking when a new development takes place and adequate spaces must be provided (and as the highways concerns report states visitor parking too). To this end

we again state our concerns over this development and suggest that the planning committee arrange a site visit to see how congested the area already is.

Many thanks

Begin forwarded message:

Rear of, 71, Prospect Road, Longwood, Huddersfield, HD3 4UY Erection of 6 dwellings. Planning objection

Rear of, 71, Prospect Road, Longwood, Huddersfield, HD3 4UY
Erection of 6 dwellings.

2018/91802

My comments:

This planning application is being objected against for the following reasons.

Highways

- See Highway concerns/requirements ref: K2-11NE-33 from previous outline application for 1 3 bed dwelling.
- Currently the area marked on the plan as 'Access Road' is just that and currently gives access to the rear of the properties on Prospect Rd as consulted for this planning application.
- The Design Access Statement refers to (Section 2.0) access via Beryl Street off Prospect St, we assume they mean Prospect Rd.
- The pavement construction in this location is not conducive of a road be capable of the taking the additional 14 cars coming in and out on a daily basis and any other associated traffic that will be created due to this proposal.

- As stated on the Highway document is 'Access to Rear back of the properties on Prospect Rd.' We feel that any additional properties will create too much traffic for this back lane and we have found that other properties built here are unable to park their cars in the designated areas during the winter weather and therefore use the main road known as Prospect Rd.
- In our opinion the road is not suitable for additional traffic nor is it suitable for additional traffic from refuse collection or emergency services if ever required.
- This back lane is only 3m wide and is unsuitable for 2 way traffic.
- The Design Access Statement suggests that Beryl St will be used for the refuse collection. Currently the refuse stored there takes up a lot of space in an already congested area so more detail would be required to show their proposal of a collection point (Section 2.3 of the statement).

Ecology

- We have seen bats on several occasions over the years we have lived in the property, within the trees located on the proposed site and feel that any new build will have an adverse effect on the bats.
- The same applicant submitted plans last year where an ecology report indicated the presence of bats. I am unsure why the applicant has now answered 'No' to question 13. The bats that have been seen at the rear of Prospect Rd have also been seen to be roosting in the now proposed area, including the garages currently used for housing domestic animals. (Section 1.2 of the Design Access Statement)
- There are existing trees in the proposed area and we have not seen a tree survey report or any indication whether these trees can be removed.
- Also, the removal of these trees could have a detrimental impact on the integrity of the rock face at the rear of the properties and in time undermine the foundations. We have been advised that the area in question may not be capable of withstanding the additional structural impact from the 7 additional dwellings described as town houses which also implies multi-level hence greater stresses on the ground and would therefore be looking to see some evidential proof from a structural engineers report .

Environmental Health

- The proposal will create noise pollution of the duration of the works.
- We are also aware of 2 neighbours and the construction noise can have a negative impact on their health;
- Although the planning applications states there are no contaminants

in the land (Section 14) it is clear from the consultation report reference WK/201724967 clearly states that this is not the case and feel the proposer has not carried out sufficient checks if they believe that they can answer no to this question. A contaminated land site survey would need to be carried out prior to the approval being considered.

- We also have concerns about potential contamination and any remediation work that will be carried out and the contaminants entering the air.

As members of the public, not fully understanding the planning laws, we are unable to see why the outline planning from March 2017 that was issued with many conditions has been put aside and a much larger proposal is now being sought on the same area of land. We did not think the site could accommodate one dwelling and certainly do not believe that 7 dwellings can be accommodated here considering the points raised above together with the inadequate infrastructure of highway and drainage.

With the above issues and the fact that this back street is not capable servicing the amount of properties that have been built in recent years we feel very strongly about this most recent planning application and ask that the planning department consider our concerns.

The above comments are till valid and we wish to further bolster our rejection of this development with the points made below.

Drainage

With respect to the drainage concerns raised by some of the other complainants I would also raise my concerns on the drainage proposals for the site. Currently the area serves as a natural soakaway for rainwater, however with the development creating additional roofs and hard standing areas I, like other concerned residents, have strong concerns as to where the water will be collected. I would also query the design of the drainage and ask what values were used for storm i.e 1 in 100 year or 1 in 50 year etc. Due to the recent floods that have occurred across the country I think it is essential that the council reviews the drainage proposals from the developers engineers. The only people that would suffer under these circumstances, if the water was not to soak away in a storm, would be the residents of Grove Nook.

Ecology

We also commented on the ecology of the site and the presence of bats. We have since noticed that the trees have been cut. If this has been done since our objection went in this does not paint a picture of a responsible developer and gives rise to other areas of non-compliance once the application has been granted.

There is also concern that the garages have asbestos roofs, we would like to see an Asbestos Management Plan as part of the application to ensure we are not subjected to asbestos being removed without compliance with The Control of Asbestos Regulations 2012.

Traffic and Roads

In pursuant with Highways Guidance Note – Section 38 Agreements for Highway Adoptions we would need to be assured that the highways department has granted the proposal for adoption and that the developer has complied with the published requirements.

Many thanks,