

RE: Planning Application 2020/60/93394/W: 4 Dorchester Rd, Fixby, HD2 2JZ [outline application for the erection of two detached dwellings].

We wish to make you aware of objections that we have about the proposed building of two detached dwellings in the garden of number 4 Dorchester Rd, namely:

- The proposed houses are in designated Green Belt and would cause the merging of the Northern extent of Huddersfield with Calderdale.
- The proposal is ill thought out in terms of access with no regard to road safety on the main arterial A641 route.
- No consideration has been given to the surrounding trees that are protected via means of Tree Preservation Orders.
- The appearance & siting would adversely impact on the amenity of our property.

Our specific objections are as follows:

1) Proposed Houses are in Designated Greenbelt

The National Planning Policy Framework Feb 2019 states in Section 13 paragraph 133 how the *'Governments attaches great importance to Green Belts. The fundamental aim of the Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open, the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permeance'*.

In paragraph 134, the purposes of Green Belt are set out, including a) *'to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas; b) to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another; c) to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment'*.

Paragraph 145 states *'A local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in the Green Belt'*.

Exceptions listed include: building for agriculture and forestry, provision of appropriate facilities for outdoor sport etc, the extension or alteration of an existing building provided that it does not result in disproportionate additions, replacement of a building, limited infilling in villages, limited affordable housing under policies set out in the development plan, limited infilling or the partial or complete redevelopment of previously developed land.

The proposed houses sit within green belt designated land. ^

This green belt corridor currently does exactly what the Government states - checks the sprawl and prevents the merging of the Fixby/Bradley Bar area with the neighbouring conurbation of Brighouse thus there is a clear line of distinction between North Huddersfield and Calderdale.

The proposed development is (as defined in paragraph 145) 'inappropriate'. It meets none of the Government's exclusion criteria. The development does nothing to address local housing needs, the addition of two 4/5-bedroom homes will not be affordable to those on a low income and the scale (two) is so small that its approval would make no discernible difference in terms of meeting targets for new homes. This is against a backdrop of significant new housing development in Fixby (Gernhill Avenue and Bradley Golf Course sites) which sit within designated housing areas.

2) Road Safety

The A641 is a main arterial route linking North Huddersfield to the strategic road network – the M62 junction 25. This stretch of dual carriageway is 40mph zone (moving to 50mph) with 2 lanes of traffic on either side separated by a central reservation, this proposal has given no thought whatsoever to the safety or practicality for the road user. A sharp left hand turn mid-way down this dual carriage way is entirely inappropriate and will lead to road conflict, interrupted traffic flows and increased accident risk. The traffic on the A641 would have priority over the access road so how the house owners would safely pull out especially with no opportunity to get up to speed is not clear. The proposal is not big enough to warrant a significant capital investment in a grade separated junction, roundabout or lights, hence the only option would be a 'simple kerb lowering junction'; if this would comply with DMRB standards is up to the Council to determine, but we urge that visibility requirements, overtaking, the increased risk of accidents, interruptions to traffic flow and knock on economic impact are all considered.

3) Trees – Impact on surrounding trees and hedging not considered and failure to comply with Kirklees Local Plan - Trees Policy LP33

We believe under the Town and Country Planning Act 1990; local planning authorities have a duty to '*make provision*' for the protection of trees within their jurisdiction.

Kirklees council certainly places a requirement on applicants to '*provide a survey of the trees located on, and immediately adjacent to the site and /or are capable of influencing the proposed site*'.

There has been no such consideration made in this proposal; no survey or Arboriculture Impact Assessment has been provided and there is no regard to the provision of documentation set out in BS 5837 *Trees In Relation to Design, Demolition and Construction*. This is despite there being a Tree Preservation Order Area running directly into the proposed development site, although we note that the majority of trees in this area have been removed.



In addition, there is a mature Willow tree of high amenity value located directly in front of the boundary fence which forms the main character feature of our back garden. No consideration has been given to the likely irreversible damage this development would cause to its root system (the development being just 1m from the boundary). The scale and impact on the tree roots and canopy must be factored in. The tree is a beautiful feature of the back garden. It by means of its age gives our back garden distinctiveness, character and acts as a focal point (it is the only large tree in our back garden area), softens the vista helping give us privacy from our neighbours as well as providing a habitat for birds and insects. There is also a series of leylandii trees running on our side of the boundary that provides some shielding and noise reduction from the A641.

We are very concerned given the proximity of the development to the existing trees in our garden that it would be considered to give rise to pressures to prune the willow and hedging thereby undermining the amenity value of the trees and their subsequent contribution to the character of our garden. We seek reassurance that, if the proposed development is approved, the occupants of the new development would not have the right to request the removal/pruning of the trees to serve their own means.

4. Inappropriate Design and no consideration of the impact on our neighbouring property

Policy LP24 Design

b. they provide a high standard of amenity for future and neighbouring occupiers; including maintaining appropriate distances between buildings and the creation of development-free buffer zones between housing and employment uses incorporating means of screening where necessary;

We believe that the proposed development is in direct contravention of this policy. It does not provide a high standard of amenity for future and neighbouring occupiers.

The proposed dwellings will be visible from our property especially. Building so close to the boundary is obtrusive, will deprive us of peaceful enjoyment of our house/garden and on an ongoing basis we /future occupiers will have to put up with noise coming from the dwelling and live with the poor outlook it will afford, this in the context of the site being in green belt and therefore our expectation that this site would be developed.

In addition, should the application be approved, we ask the council to consider using its powers to enforce controlled hours of operation and other restrictions that might make the duration of the works more bearable.

Given the only current access is down a narrow pathway which runs the length of our house, until the proposed access from the A641 there will be no option but to haul all materials past our house which will undoubtedly be severely noisy and disruptive.

We would be grateful if the council would take our objections into consideration when deciding this application.