

From:
To: [\[redacted\]](#)
Subject: FW: Planning Application 2021/90060
Date: 04 May 2021 07:46:21

Sent: 28 April 2021 17:45

Subject: Planning Application 2021/90060

Dear Ellie

Thanks for returning my call and allowing me to submit late comments/objections regarding the erection of a takeaway adjacent to 9 Station Road, Marsden. As explained during our conversation we

were completely unaware of the planning application until we were able
I would like to think that due to the very high impact that this development
would have on our property and bearing in mind the restrictions in place that details would have
been sent as happens with most correspondence with Kirklees
Council.

We have owned [redacted] for nearly nineteen years now and during normal times we, or family members, visited regularly and during holiday periods, making us feel completely at home in Marsden. Although even before lockdown our visits had been reduced as the continual work on the [redacted] made it less enjoyable. Pre covid we held a cordial meeting with Stephen Byram and he was able to explain their plans for the pub and number seven and this gained our trust. We decided that even though it may have some impact on us, it will be tastefully done and of genuine benefit to the community, so we decided there was no need for objections. We feel a little betrayed now as at no stage were plans for the fast food outlet mentioned, hence no need to worry further, we could get back to "normal" once work was completed. It almost seems as though full advantage of the lockdown has been taken, knowing we were unlikely to be aware of the situation.

Although it doesn't affect Marsden in general, one of our major concerns is the effect it will have on the value of our property, although I am not sure if the planning department take this into consideration so have not included it in the main objections listed below.

it actually seems as though we don't exist when reading either the Consultation responses from Kirklees Council or the Responses to their comments. For example in the Response to Consultee Comments it claims "there will be no impact on the existing units within the former Swan public house....." which of course are owned by the respondent, and completely ignores the impact it will have

Surely they should either be 5a & 5b or 7a & 7b, or a combination of both, as they are part of these buildings. In any event the mail for 9a & 9b has been posted through

a). The planned building is only a few feet away from [REDACTED] This will inevitably mean that people will be congregating outside for 14 hours per day long into the evening (more hours than the Swan was open). During busy times this is likely to cause intrusion to the rear, side and front of [REDACTED] We are often [REDACTED] and the disturbance will be intolerable. It is hard to see how anyone can believe there will be no impact. Despite the measures stated in the Consultee Comments there will be increased noise, smell, litter and some light pollution. This will further exacerbate the issues already experienced in Marsden when the Ale Trail resumes after lockdown.

c). One wonders the effectiveness of being in the Marsden Conservation Area, it appears that only lip service is paid to this policy. The photographs included in the submission are recent and show the site in an unfavourable light in an effort to minimise the impact of the building which should not be allowed in a conservation area.

e). There is no need for an additional food outlet in Marsden. For a village of its size there are many more such facilities than in most areas. At a quick count I make it around thirteen

establishments centrally displaced with a further two Chinese takeaways just outside the centre. Apart from cafes there are wine bars, restaurants, a chip shop and pizza options, most of which provide a takeaway service plus a bakery and even the CO-OP who offer sandwiches and other light bites. Over and above this there are also several clubs who serve food and drinks. It is hard to justify yet another. The Consultation Response from Kirklees Policy mentions twelve establishments, two being hot food takeaways. These are dedicated takeaways and it ignores the fact that many of the others also cater for this option.

f). The Response to Consultee Comments refers to "The unit will be serviced from the roadside, which is the same method as the public house did for all the years it was in operation." This is totally misleading, it was never serviced from the roadside, the few people that used it bought their drinks in the Swan and then walked along the street to the area in question.

the publican also asked them not to use the area after 8.00 pm. The beer garden was never much of a success, probably due to the direct competition with the Riverhead Brewery sited on the opposite side of the river, which has a vast amount of riverside seating.

There are many more comments I could make, but I hope this gives you some idea of the impact this development would have and that it will be taken into full consideration. I would appreciate acknowledgement that you have received this submission and to be advised of any developments regarding this planning application via email.