

Address: 199 High Street Batley WF17 6DP

About the application

Application number: 2021/62/91871/E	
What is the application for?:	Erection of residential development (55 dwellings) including access and associat
Address of the site or building:	Land adj, High Street and Challenge Way, Hanging Heaton, Batley
Postcode:	WF10 4UA

User comments

Type of comment: An objection	
Do you wish your comments to be published on the website anonymously?	No
I wish to object to this planning application on a number of grounds: 1) When Challenge Way was first built, local residents recall being told by the council that there was no need to build a banking between the road and High Street as the field would act as a natural boundary and would dilute fumes such as Nitrous Oxide, so they would be at background level by the time they reach properties. If this field is taken away, the question arises as to what difference replacing greenery with concrete, tarmac etc makes to the pollution levels. I also understand that the stretch of trees were originally planted as part of the planning permission for Challenge Way, to screen the properties on High Street from noise / vibration / pollution. If part of these trees are chopped down, does this not go against the original planning permission? The destruction of these trees will have a hugely negative impact - it will put all residents both new and existing, at risk from pollution. At the very least an Air Quality Impact Assessment should be carried out before planning permission is considered. 2) Related to the above point, this land was allocated for housing in the local plan in February 2019. In September 2019 a Climate Crisis was declared by Kirklees and they produced the Air Quality Action Plan. In light of the Air Quality Action Plan, should the local plan not be revisited to ensure all land on there is still fit for purpose? Surveys carried out by the WHO state that living within 50 meters of a main road can cause an increase in diseases. The four most Easterly properties on the new development will suffer a double threat from Leeds Road and Challenge Way. Children living in these homes could be at an extremely high risk of disease from pollution. I do not believe that this land can still be considered a good area to build on given its location next to what the developers themselves describe themselves as a "busy highway" which is the main artery for traffic from Batley and parts of Dewsbury to the M1 and M62. Indeed, other parts of Leeds Road have already been declared as Air Quality Management Areas. Removing the field which filters out a lot of Nitrous Oxide from Leeds Road, combined with the other developments that are planned for the area (300 homes between Soothill and Mill Forest Way; 250 homes opposite Dewsbury Rams; 1500 homes at Chidwell) has the potential to push our area over the limit of pollution levels	

homes at Childswell) has the potential to push our area over the limit of pollution levels. The Local Plan therefore is now out of date and consideration needs to be made to removing this area from the plan.

3) As per ecology report, the trees are used by a variety of animals, including a local bat colony, and to destroy these trees would destroy their foraging habitat. In addition, given this land has never been ploughed, it's a natural meadow which attracts a lot of birds, insects, butterflies etc every year. The reports done by the developers were all in winter, when less animals and insects were present (eg. The Bat survey was done in October which is out of season and therefore renders the survey useless). The field and trees are part of the Kirklees Wildlife Habitat Network, which as per part of Kirklees own policy is required to be protected. (It is worth noting here as an aside, ALL the surveys done by the developers eg noise, traffic, were done during lockdown and are not a true reflection).

4) There is already an existing issue with surface water flooding at High Street. Yorkshire Water have told residents over the years that the field is a soakaway for water flowing down from Hanging Heaton. The field often gets water logged very easily if we have high rainfall and the back gardens in High Street can often be flooded for most of winter. If the field is taken away, where will all this water go? In addition there are (at least) two streams which flow under properties to the East (including the club). The consultation reports from Yorkshire Water and the Local Flood Authority do not seem to address this at all. The streams and flooding issues need much further investigation.

5) Over the years planning permission has been granted on the properties at High Street to extend homes and build balconies etc. If these new properties existed already then undoubtedly planning permission would not have been granted as it would create a privacy issue. As the homes on High Street are elevated above the proposed new homes, existing living spaces will look directly down into the new homes' bedrooms. Why is no allowance being made for the elevation? In most council's policies there is an additional distance stated (eg Watford Borough Council state where existing homes are elevated above new homes, the 21m should be increased to 27.5m). Why is this not being taken into consideration here? Why has the new development not been designed so that the bedroom windows don't directly face the current properties living area? The design submitted makes it impossible for the current residents to be able to live in their homes without feeling their privacy is being invaded.

6) Does this development go against Kirklees own policies on urban sprawl and protecting green space? Hanging Heaton prides itself on the strong sense of community felt by the residents who live here. The field is the boundary between Hanging Heaton and Batley. This development will build over the existing boundary between Dewsbury and Batley. Taking away this greenspace means there is no boundary for Hanging Heaton and we will be merged with Shaw Cross.

7) The plans as submitted currently include building on land which is not owned by the developers. I believe the boundary line on the original plan is incorrect and is in fact 1.8m further into the field. In the Kirklees Planning and Building Policy, it states 10.5m must be left between a habitable window and the boundary. As the boundary is incorrect on the plans, this distance will not be met.

