

From:
To: [DCAdmin](#)
Subject: Ref: 2020/93365
Date: 03 December 2020 14:05:22

Planning ref 2020/93365

30/11/2020

Dear Sir/Madam ,

I urge you to take this letter into consideration regarding the development of site: 2020/93365. The site is listed as adjacent to 2 Mountain Way; however, 2 Mountain Way is sited at the opposite end of the lane near Stafford Hill Lane 2 Orchard Road is adjacent to the site. The plot has never been a garden within the boundaries of a dwelling in Kirkheaton. The original entrance to 2 Orchard Road was from Orchard Road not Mountain Way the boundary is wrong on the proposed planning map as it appears to include the public rights of way in front of and into the fields behind.

Building on this land may add to the surface water flooding between 8 and 12 Mountain Way. In recent flash-floods the water from Orchard Road floods down onto Mountain Way joining the flooding from nearby stream yards from the plot. Currently there are no surface water drains on this section of road to channel the water away.

The Supporting Planning Statement from AK Planning (2020-93365_+General_832894) cites the site "has previously had domestic scale sheds on it". However, it has not had any sheds on it since or before 1965. A local resident kept rabbits in a shed in the field behind it, maybe that's where the misinformation stems from.

The plot of land for development is an historic site for which have always hibernated in the dry-stone wall at the rear of the plot. It is within 200m of a Any development should take into account this vital habitat for the endangered and protected creatures.

Since the original planning application was submitted in the 1962 Mountain way had undergone major changes: houses at 2 and 4 have undergone extensive transformations, number 6 has been rebuilt along with number 2 Orchard Road. There have been two further houses built; number 10 and 12. These houses are very different from proposed development and a new build on the plot could be detrimental to the area. As a single-track private drive maintained by the current residents it is imperative that cars are not parked on the road to allow access to emergency services.

The application made is very similar to those made in 2017 (2017-94195 and 2020-93365) and should be refused on the same grounds as it is Greenbelt land. The comments raised and the conclusions made in the Delegated report (2017-94195_Delegated+Report_674 227) are still valid and should be taken into consideration when assessing the latest planning application.

Thank you for your consideration in this matter.

Yours faithfully,