

From:
To: [DCAdmin](#)
Subject: comments and objection to Application 2020/62/93954/W
Date: 24 January 2023 17:09:37

Please present this objection anonymously

Please find below my comments and objection to Application 2020/62/93954/W

I wish to make a further comment regarding The Local Plan in relation to this application. I am very disheartened by the planners disregard for their own Local Plan. I have recently asked for a reason why the indicative number of houses for the site (and many other aspects of the Local Plan) has been ignored .

I am told that indicative number for this site is based on numbers in a previous application, 2014/93946, and the area was not fully assessed . This goes against all I have read in the many objections that have been made with regard to planning protocols for this site. I do not intend to repeat them.

HS125, were based on extant permissions at the time the local plan was being drafted (in this case, application 2014/93946).

I cannot believe that this number was agreed to just because the previous proposal was for around 25 houses. Was this the case for all potential housing developments in the Local Plan and if it can be exceeded by 25% as in this case, doesn't it require review?

I would say that this reasonably adjusted number is not based on the previous application but on the topography of the site, difficult drainage issues , location and both national and local policies and guidelines.

Clearly local residents have an understanding of the original plan and I suspect would have made no objection to a similar development , rather than the almost 300 that have been submitted.

“ The 36 dwellings referred to in the Local Plan is an indicative figure only. It is not a hard cap nor definitive guidance. Each application and their respective density must be assessed on their own merits. If a higher (or lower) density than the indicative figure is proposed, the impacts of the density will be considered against the material considerations, such as securing an effective use of land, highways, design and amenity etc.”

Interestingly it is these very “material considerations” above that all residents have objected to within this submission. Maybe the Local Plan is worth the paper it is written on and is a better reflection of what local residents, Kirklees ratepayers, see as acceptable and good practice in housing developments.

I still have concerns about the following

Effective use of land - major concerns about drainage of the site, loss of environmental qualities, opportunity to improve the area with a sense of rural place rather than an urban housing estate, poor planning for sustainability and a positive environmental effect.

Highways - horrific concerns about Lingards Road , its structural capacity to support the dwellings, its width and access on to it from the houses that will abut it.

Design - ridiculously high houses , build on plinths to afford residents good views at the expense of local amenity for all existing residents using crazy amounts of hardcore and concrete to hold them up, positioned

with the terraces and patio doors on the dark side of the hill so no benefit from natural light or heat.

These are precisely the reasons why the Local Plan should have been adhered to; suitable number of houses of appropriate design, suiting both local requirements and blending into the landscape and acknowledging the community input that informed the Local Plan. I am sure the people involved in the Local Plan production at both local and national level would not agree that the indicative number was just based on a previous planning application from 2014 but on all the components of the plan that many people have outlined in their objections - how can so many ordinary people be so wrong.

Yours faithfully