

**Objection to application for planning
permission for the erection of residential
development (55 dwellings) including
access and associated infrastructure on
land adjacent to High Street and Challenge
Way, Hanging Heaton, Batley**

**Planning application number:
2021/62/91871/E**

Planning objection

September 2021

Objection to application for planning permission for the erection of residential development (55 dwellings) including access and associated infrastructure on land adjacent to High Street and Challenge Way, Hanging Heaton, Batley

Planning application number: 2021/62/91871/E

1. Introduction

- 1.1 These objections have been prepared on behalf of a number of local residents whose properties adjoin the Site. A list of those represented is attached at Appendix 1.
- 1.2 An application for planning permission has been submitted to Kirklees Council ("the Council") for the erection of 55 dwelling with access and infrastructure on on land adjacent to High Street and Challenge Way, Hanging Heaton, Batley ("the Site"). The application has been assigned planning application number 2021/62/91871/E ("the Application").
- 1.3 The Site is approximately 1.76ha of greenfield grassland. The Site is allocated within the Kirklees Local Plan as a housing site (HS51) with an indicative capacity of 61 dwellings. The Site is within a Biodiversity Opportunity Zone – Pennine Foothills, the woodland along the eastern site boundary is a Wildlife Habitat Network and the Site is located within a Mineral Safeguarding Area. The site is also adjacent to a Biodiversity Opportunity Zone – Valley Slopes and is bounded on three sides by the green belt.
- 1.4 Our clients object to the Application for the reasons set out below.

2. Statutory Context

- 2.1 In accordance with Section 38(6) Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 any application for planning permission should be determined in accordance with the Development Plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

3. The Development Plan

- 3.1 The Development Plan for the area in which the Site is situated consists of the Kirklees Local Plan which was adopted on 27th February 2019 (“the Local Plan”).
- 3.2 The Site was previously Green Belt but was allocated within the Local Plan as a potential housing site HS51.
- 3.3 The Allocations and Designations document confirms that the Site has the following constraints:
- A combined sewer crosses this site
 - Potentially contaminated land
 - Noise source near site - noise from road traffic
 - Site is close to listed buildings
 - Part of the site is within a high risk coal referral area
- 3.4 The allocation confirmed that any application for planning permission should be accompanied by the following reports:
- Transport Statement
 - Flood Risk Assessment
 - Contamination report (Phase 1 and 2)
 - Noise assessment
 - Low Emission Travel Plan
 - Heritage Impact Assessment
 - Health Impact Assessment
 - Coal Mining Risk Assessment
- 3.5 Local Plan Policy LP1 is concerned with Presumption in favour of sustainable development and provides:

“When considering development proposals, the council will take a positive approach that reflects the presumption in favour of sustainable development contained in the National Planning Policy Framework.

The council will always work pro-actively with applicants jointly to find solutions which mean that proposals can be approved wherever possible, and to secure development that improves the economic, social and environmental conditions in the area.

Proposals that accord with the policies in the Kirklees Local Plan (and, where relevant, with policies in neighbourhood plans) will be approved without delay, unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

Where there are no policies relevant to the proposal or relevant policies are out of date at the time of making the decision then the council will grant permission unless material considerations indicate otherwise – taking into account whether:

- a. any adverse impacts of granting permission would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the National Planning Policy Framework taken as a whole; or*
- b. specific policies in that Framework indicate that development should be restricted.”*

3.6 It is our view that material considerations indicate that planning permission should be refused in accordance with Policy LP1 for the reasons set out in section 5 below.

3.7 Local Policy LP21 of the Local Plan is concerned with highway safety and provides:

“Proposals shall demonstrate that they can accommodate sustainable modes of transport and be accessed effectively and safely by all users.

New development will normally be permitted where safe and suitable access to the site can be achieved for all people and where the residual cumulative impacts of development are not severe.

Proposals shall demonstrate adequate information and mitigation measures to avoid a detrimental impact on highway safety and the local highway network.

Proposals shall also consider any impacts on the Strategic Road Network. All proposals shall:

- a. Ensure the safe and efficient flow of traffic within the development and on the surrounding highway network;*
- b. where needed, provide new infrastructure or improvements on or off site may be required to ensure safe access to the development site for pedestrians, cyclists, public transport users, and private vehicles*
- c. be accompanied by a supporting Transport Assessment or Transport Statement where the development would generate significant trip generation, providing detail as to the impact on highway safety, air quality, noise and light restrictions;*
- d. take into account changes in site levels and topography to ensure the development can be accessed easily and safely by all sections of the community and by different modes of transport;*
- e. take into account the features of surrounding roads and footpaths and provide adequate layout and visibility to allow the development to be accessed safely;*
- f. take into account access for emergency, service and refuse collection vehicles;*
- g. provide on-site safe, secure and convenient cycle parking/storage facilities to encourage sustainable travel modes.”*

3.8 We do not consider that the proposal satisfies Policy LP21 for the reasons set out in section 5 below and we support the concerns of the Council's highway officer.

3.9 Policy LP24 is concerned with design and provides:

“Good design should be at the core of all proposals in the district and should be considered at the outset of the development process, ensuring that design forms part of pre-application consultation of a proposal. Development briefs, design codes and masterplans should be used to secure high quality, green, accessible, inclusive and safe design, where applicable. Where appropriate and in agreement with the developer schemes will be submitted for design review.

Proposals should promote good design by ensuring:

- a. the form, scale, layout and details of all development respects and enhances the character of the townscape, heritage assets and landscape;*
- 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;*
- c. extensions are subservient to the original building, are in keeping with the existing buildings in terms of scale, materials and details and minimise impact on residential amenity of future and neighbouring occupiers;*
- d. high levels of sustainability, to a degree proportionate to the proposal, through:*
 - i. The re-use and adaptation of existing buildings, where practicable;*

- ii. *design that promotes behavioural change, promoting walkable neighbourhoods and making walking and cycling more attractive;*
 - iii. *considering the use of innovative construction materials and techniques, including reclaimed and recycled materials;*
 - iv. *where practicable, minimising resource use in the building by orientating buildings to utilise passive solar design. This includes encouraging the incorporation of vegetation and tree planting to assist heating and cooling and considering the use of renewable energy;*
 - v. *providing charging points to encourage the use of electric and low emission vehicles;*
 - vi. *incorporating adequate facilities to allow occupiers to separate and store waste for recycling and recovery that are well designed and visually unobtrusive and allows for the convenient collection of waste;*
 - vii. *designing buildings that are resilient and resistant to flood risk, where such buildings are acceptable in accordance with flood risk policies and through incorporation of multi-functional green infrastructure where appropriate;*
 - viii. *designing places that are adaptable and able to respond to change, with consideration given to accommodating services and infrastructure, access to high quality public transport facilities and offer flexibility to meet changing requirements of the resident / user.*
- e. *the risk of crime is minimised by enhanced security, and the promotion of well-defined routes, overlooked streets and places, high levels of activity, and well-designed security features;*

- f. the needs of a range of different users are met, including disabled people, older people and families with small children to create accessible and inclusive places;*
- g. any new open space is accessible, safe, overlooked and strategically located within the site and well integrated into wider green infrastructure networks;*
- h. development contributes towards enhancement of the natural environment, supports biodiversity and connects to and enhances ecological networks and green infrastructure;*
- i. the retention of valuable or important trees and where appropriate the planting of new trees and other landscaping to maximise visual amenity and environmental benefits; and*
- j. the provision of public art where appropriate.”*

3.10 The application fails to accord with Policy LP24 on many grounds, as set out in section 5 below.

3.11 Policy LP28 is concerned with drainage and provides:

“The presumption is that Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) will be used to assist in achieving the following on each site:

- a. for proposals on greenfield sites, typical greenfield run-off rates should not be exceeded;*
- b. for proposals on brownfield sites there should be a minimum 30% reduction in surface water run-off where previous positive surface water connections from the site can be proven. New connections will be subject to at least greenfield restrictions;*
- c. No negative impact on local water quality and improvements in water quality where practicable;*

- d. *Consider whether proposed open spaces and green infrastructure within sites can contribute to the sustainable drainage of the site.*

Local conditions including the existence of critical drainage areas may require a lower run-off rate to be agreed to reflect volume control, local surface water risks, water course capacity and flood risk further downstream.

There will be a general presumption against pumping surface water. It must also be demonstrated that the surface water management solution is designed to meet requirements over the lifetime of the development including evidence that management and maintenance arrangements have been secured to cover that period. This includes ensuring proposals to store water meet national standards and latest best practice.

Flow paths accommodating water from outside the site or due to an exceedance event should be designed to avoid buildings and curtilages.

Development will only be permitted if it can be demonstrated that the water supply and waste water infrastructure required is available or can be co-ordinated to meet the demand generated by the new development.”

- 3.12 The proposal does not accord with Policy LP28 for the reasons set out in section 5 below.
- 3.13 Policy LP31 is concerned with the strategic green infrastructure network and provides:

“Within the Strategic Green Infrastructure Network identified on the Policies Map, priority will be given to safeguarding and enhancing green infrastructure networks, green infrastructure assets and the

range of functions they provide. Development proposals within and adjacent to the Strategic Green Infrastructure Network should ensure:

- (i) the function and connectivity of green infrastructure networks and assets are retained or replaced;*
- (ii) new or enhanced green infrastructure is designed and integrated into the development scheme where appropriate, including natural greenspace, woodland and street trees;*
- (iii) the scheme integrates in to existing and proposed cycling, bridleway and walking routes, particularly the Core Walking and Cycling Network, by providing new connecting links where opportunities exist;*
- (iv) the protection and enhancement of biodiversity and ecological links, particularly within and connecting to the Kirklees Wildlife Habitat Network. The council will support proposals for the creation of new or enhanced green infrastructure provided these do not conflict with other Local Plan policies.”*

3.14 The Site is located within and adjacent to strategic green infrastructure and the application clearly fails to enhance green infrastructure, in fact it will have a significant negative and damaging impact upon it, this is contrary to Policy LP31

3.15 Policy LP33 is concerned with trees and provides:

“The Council will not grant planning permission for developments which directly or indirectly threaten trees or woodlands of significant amenity. Proposals should normally retain any valuable or important trees where they make a contribution to public amenity, the distinctiveness of a specific location or contribute to the environment, including the Wildlife Habitat Network and green infrastructure networks. Proposals will need to comply with relevant national standards regarding the protection of trees in relation to design, demolition and construction. Where tree loss

is deemed to be acceptable, developers will be required to submit a detailed mitigation scheme.”

- 3.16 For the reasons set out in section 5 below the trees between the Site and Challenge Way serve many functions. These trees are extremely valuable in terms of amenity, ecology, noise protection, air pollution protection and the wider climate change issues. The proposal is contrary to Policy LP33.

4. Material Considerations

National Planning Policy Framework (“NPPF”)

- 4.1 The NPPF was first published in March 2012 and most recently updated in July 2021. The NPPF sets out the Governments planning policies for England and how these are expected to be applied. The following paragraphs which are relevant to the Application.

- 4.2 Paragraph 7 of the NPPF provides:

“The purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development. At a very high level, the objective of sustainable development can be summarised as meeting the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own need...”

- 4.3 Paragraph 47 of the NPPF provides:

“Planning law requires that applications for planning permission be determined in accordance with the development plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise. Decisions on applications should be made as quickly as possible, and within statutory timescales unless a longer period has been agreed by the applicant in writing.”

- 4.4 Paragraph 108 of the NPPF provides:

“In assessing sites that may be allocated for development in plans, or specific applications for development, it should be ensured that:

- a) *appropriate opportunities to promote sustainable transport modes can be – or have been – taken up, given the type of development and its location;*
- b) *safe and suitable access to the site can be achieved for all users; and*
- c) *any significant impacts from the development on the transport network (in terms of capacity and congestion), or on highway safety, can be cost effectively mitigated to an acceptable degree.”*

4.5 Paragraph 112 of the NPPF provides

“Within this context, applications for development should:

- a) *give priority first to pedestrian and cycle movements, both within the scheme and with neighbouring areas; and second – so far as possible – to facilitating access to high quality public transport, with layouts that maximise the catchment area for bus or other public transport services, and appropriate facilities that encourage public transport use;*
- b) *address the needs of people with disabilities and reduced mobility in relation to all modes of transport;*
- c) *create places that are safe, secure and attractive – which minimise the scope for conflicts between pedestrians, cyclists and vehicles, avoid unnecessary street clutter, and respond to local character and design standards;*
- d) *allow for the efficient delivery of goods, and access by service and emergency vehicles; and*
- e) *be designed to enable charging of plug-in and other ultra-low emission vehicles in safe, accessible and convenient locations.”*

4.6 Paragraph 119 of the NPPF provides:

“Planning policies and decisions should promote an effective use of land in meeting the need for homes and other uses, while safeguarding and improving the environment and ensuring safe and healthy living conditions. Strategic policies should set out a clear strategy for accommodating objectively assessed needs, in a way that makes as much use as possible of previously-developed or ‘brownfield’ land.”

4.7 Paragraph 120 of the NPPF confirms:

“Planning policies and decision should:

...

- (b) recognise that some undeveloped land can perform many functions, such as for wildlife, recreation, flood risk mitigation, colling/shading, carbon storage or food production;

...”

4.8 Paragraph 130 of the NPPF provides:

“Planning policies and decisions should ensure that developments:

- a) will function well and add to the overall quality of the area, not just for the short term but over the lifetime of the development;*
- b) are visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and appropriate and effective landscaping;*
- c) are sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting, while not preventing or discouraging appropriate innovation or change (such as increased densities);*
- d) establish or maintain a strong sense of place, using the arrangement of streets, spaces, building types and materials to*

create attractive, welcoming and distinctive places to live, work and visit;

- e) optimise the potential of the site to accommodate and sustain an appropriate amount and mix of development (including green and other public space) and support local facilities and transport networks; and*
- f) create places that are safe, inclusive and accessible and which promote health and well-being, with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users; and where crime and disorder, and the fear of crime, do not undermine the quality of life or community cohesion and resilience.”*

4.9 Paragraph 131 of the NPPF provides:

“Trees make an important contribution to the character and quality of urban environments, and can also help mitigate and adapt to climate change. Planning policies and decisions should ensure that new streets are tree-lines, that opportunities are taken to incorporate trees elsewhere in developments (such as parks and community orchards), that appropriate measures are in place to secure the long-term maintenance of newly-planted trees, and that existing trees are retained wherever possible. Applicants and local planning authorities should work with highways officers and tree officers to ensure that the right trees are planted in the right places, and solutions are found that are compatible with highway standards and the needs of different users.”

4.10 Paragraph 132 of the NPPF is concerned with design and community engagement and provides:

“...

Applicants should work closely with those affected by their proposals to evolve designs that take account of the views of the community.

Applications that can demonstrate early, proactive and effective engagement with the community should be looked on more favourably than those that cannot.”

4.11 Paragraph 187 of the NPPF provides:

“Planning policies and decisions should ensure that new development can be integrated effectively with existing businesses and community facilities (such as places of worship, pubs, music venues and sports clubs). Existing businesses and facilities should not have unreasonable restrictions placed on them as a result of development permitted after they were established. Where the operation of an existing business or community facility could have a significant adverse effect on new development (including changes of use) in its vicinity, the applicant (or ‘agent of change’) should be required to provide suitable mitigation before the development has been completed.”

Supplementary Planning Documents (“SPD”)

4.12 The Householders Design Guide SPD was adopted June 2019. The design guide set out a number of principles for developers. All the principles are relevant to this proposal. However, the following seem to be the key principles which have not been satisfactorily addresses as part of this application.

4.13 Principle 6 is concerned with residential amenity and provides:

“Residential layouts must ensure adequate privacy and maintain high standards of residential amenity, to avoid negative impacts on light, outlook and to avoid overlooking”

4.14 For the reasons set out in section 5 below the proposal would have a significant negative impact on privacy, overlooking and residential amenity for both existing and potential future occupiers.

4.15 Principle 7 is concerned with green infrastructure and open space and provides:

“The integration of green infrastructure and accessible open space must be considered early in the design process by assessing:

the site's context;

the ability to make connections with wider green infrastructure networks; and

the multi-functional role green infrastructure can perform.

Proposals should retain existing features within the site, such as valuable trees, natural wildlife habitats and landscape features. Green infrastructure can be provided through building features such as green roofs and green walls and through the design of streets to include street trees, and trees within residential plots and open spaces. Open Space, particularly for recreation, should be located at the heart of the site and designed to help create identity.”

4.16 The proposal fails against this principle for the reason set out in section 5 below.

4.17 Principle 9 is concerned with biodiversity and provides:

“Proposals are required to provide net gains in biodiversity, with ecological enhancement integral to the design of the development. At the outset of the design process the wildlife habitat network and Habitats of Principal Importance should be considered in addition to protected species and the maintenance and management arrangements for any wildlife spaces need to be clearly set out.”

4.18 The proposal fails against this principle for the reasons set out in section 5 below.

5. Reasons for objection

5.1 The first thing to note when looking at this application is that the views of the community have not been taken into consideration as part of the development of the proposal, this is clearly contrary to the NPPF.

- 5.2 The properties closest to the Site are located on High Street. Due to the topography of the Site the existing residents would be elevated above the proposed dwellings. This would create significant privacy and overlooking issues which are unique given the topography. The existing residents would have the new residents looking up into their windows and would have very clear views from their primary living spaces into the new homes bedroom windows and gardens which could not be mitigated against with the normal boundary treatments which are proposed (1.8m high fences), this is due to the height differences. This would result in an unacceptable degree of overlooking and loss of privacy for both the current occupiers and the proposed occupiers. This is an unacceptable impact on residential amenity for both existing and potential future occupiers. This point cannot be appreciated from the plans but is clearly evident from a site visit.
- 5.3 The Design Guide SPD confirms that for two storey houses a minimum separation distance of 21m between facing habitable rooms at the back of dwellings should be provided. The proposal contains dwellings over two stories and the topography of the site means that these usually accepted separation distances are not acceptable on this site. Acceptable separation distances are not being achieved here, for example 199 High Street has a second floor conservatory, which will look directly into the new home's bedroom and the conservatory is only currently 9.2m from the existing timber fence on the plans, the gardens of those proposed dwellings are not over 10m long and therefore even the minimum separation distances cannot be achieved and in any event we would advocate for greater distances due to the topography of the site and the fact that we are not considering standard two storey dwellings on either side of the fence.
- 5.4 The design, form, layout and scale of this development does not respond to nor enhance the character of the area and does not represent good development as sought by local and national planning policy.
- 5.5 The proposal is therefore clearly contrary to Policy LP24 the NPPF and has not been designed in accordance with the Design Guide SPD.

- 5.6 The trees which form the current barrier between the Site and Challenge Way form part of the green infrastructure network. In addition it is our clients understanding that these trees were originally planted as part of the planning permission for Challenge Way as a way of screening and protecting the properties on High Street from noise, vibration and air pollution.
- 5.7 This row of trees serves many functions both from an ecological, amenity and environmental perspective. The proposed development does not place a significant enough emphasis on the importance of this tree line and the proposed loss of trees would have significant negative impacts on the both existing and potential future residents.
- 5.8 These trees protect residents from the noise and emissions of the vehicles using Challenge Way. We take issue with the noise and air quality assessments which have been submitted as part of the application and ask that these are fully scrutinised by your experts within the Council.
- 5.9 The loss of trees should be avoided and equally the role these trees play in mitigating climate change and air quality should not be underestimated. The application must be considered against the NPPFs policies to protect trees and recognise the vital role that they play.
- 5.10 This piece of undeveloped land performs a very important function for wildlife, recreation, flood elevation, public health protection and climate change. The site should be retained to continue this important function in accordance with paragraph 120 of the NPPF.
- 5.11 As per the submitted 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 undertaken by the applicant were not undertaken at optimum times and indeed the bat survey was undertaken in October which is "out of season" for this sort of survey.

- 5.12 Our clients concerns are echoed by the Council's own Ecology officer who has also raised concerns regarding the loss of biodiversity and concerns around the suitability of the bat survey work. The officer confirms that the submitted information *"...does not address the significance of potential impacts on bat foraging or connectivity within the Kirklees Wildlife Habitat Network..."* The conclusion of the ecology officer is that the information submitted is insufficient on ecology grounds.
- 5.13 The loss of trees, failure to enhance the green infrastructure network and the loss of important ecological sites is all contrary to both local and national planning policies. This harm cannot be overcome by any perceived benefit of developing this site in the manner proposed.
- 5.14 As set out above the trees were planted as part of the Challenge Way road development. 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 reached properties. If the Site is developed the pollution levels will be at unacceptable levels for existing and potential future occupiers and it will cease to serve this vital function.
- 5.15 The World Health Organisation have confirmed that living within 50 meters of a main road can cause an increase in diseases. The four most easterly properties proposed to be built on the Site would be at double threat from Leeds Road and Challenge Way. Children living in these homes could be at a high risk of disease from pollution. A Climate Emergency was declared by Kirklees in 2019 and the Air Quality Action Plan was produced following adoption of the Local Plan. Given the Air Quality Action Plan and the declaration of the Climate Emergency following allocation of this Site for housing it is unconscionable to think that it is acceptable to build family homes in such close proximity to a "busy highway" which is the main artery for traffic from Batley and parts of Dewsbury to the M1 and M62. We are aware that 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 Chidswell) has the potential to push our area over the limit of acceptable pollution levels. The cumulative impact should be fully assessed. This is contrary to both local and national policy and a serious concern.

- 5.16 As set out above the trees serve as a noise buffer from Challenge Way and noise is a significant issue for this Site. It is therefore surprising that the noise survey was carried out during Covid19 lockdown when traffic levels were extremely low due to the working from home order and HGVs passing through were at an all-time low. However, even with this, the levels were breached numerous times and noise is therefore obviously going to be an issue for future occupiers.
- 5.17 In addition, the Working Men's Club is a noise source and it was closed during the survey due to lockdown. The Club has regular functions and events which create noise when the windows are open for ventilation. The Working Men's Club is a Community Asset and its continuing ability to operate and hold functions is imperative and should be protected in accordance with the NPPF.
- 5.18 The Council Environmental Health officer has confirmed that despite additional information having been submitted the issue of noise remains unresolved. The latest consultation response confirms:

"... the point remains about future occupiers being exposed to high levels of noise when opening windows for ventilation. Acoustic trickle ventilation alone is unlikely to provide sufficient ventilation to help control thermal comfort without the need to open windows and is therefore not acceptable and so a recommendation is made for a further noise report to address these concerns and also those of the external amenity area."

- 5.19 The Site currently operates as a soakaway for water flowing down from Hanging Heaton. The field often gets water logged and the gardens along High Street often get standing water. Drainage and flooding must be fully considered and we do not consider that the submitted information has fully addressed this issue. There are also two streams which run underneath properties to the east of the Site, including the Working Men's Club and this has not been addressed by Yorkshire Water nor the Lead Local Flood Authority. Can we please urge that the whole drainage and flooding plans be reassessed fully to ensure that they do indeed comply with local and national policy as it is our submission that they may not.
- 5.20 In relation to access and the internal access arrangements we do have concerns. We note the concerns of the Highway Officer and we reserve the right to make further submissions on highway grounds once the additional requested information has been submitted.
- 5.21 Our clients consider that the traffic survey submitted in support of the application is not reflective of "normal" highway conditions (outside of Covid times) and the assessment needs to be made based on "normal" conditions. Our clients have undertaken a traffic count on two different days and the traffic recorded was significantly higher than the estimated level of vehicle movements contained within the applicants survey. We urge the Council to review the information submitted and fully scrutinise the data.
- 5.22 For the reasons set out above the proposal does not represent sustainable development and it would not improve the social or environmental conditions of the area, in fact it would have a negative impact upon them.
- 5.22 The proposed development would fail to achieve a high level of amenity for existing occupiers and would in fact have a significant negative impact upon their residential amenity, as well as the amenity of any future occupiers, contrary to the Development Plan and the NPPF.

6. Conclusion

- 6.1 For the reasons set out above the Application does not accord with the Development Plan, nor National Policy.
- 6.2 The adverse impacts of the proposal would significantly and demonstrably outweigh any perceived benefits.
- 6.3 In accordance with the statutory context planning permission should not be granted. We therefore respectfully request that planning permission be refused.

September 2021

Appendix 1

List of people represented by this objection:

201 High Street

Hanging Heaton

WF12 7HF

199 High Street

Hanging Heaton

WF17 6DP

197 High Street

Hanging Heaton

WF17 6DP

195 High Street

Hanging Heaton

WF17 6DP

193 High Street

Hanging Heaton

WF17 6DP