

From:
To: [DCAdmin](#)
Subject: Application number 2021/62/93006/E. An objection
Date: 06 September 2021 09:32:00

Regarding the application number 2021/62/93006, Yew Tree Farm in Farnley Tyas

The law defines Conservation Areas as 'areas of special architectural or historic interest, the character or appearance of which it is desirable to preserve or enhance'. This means **conservation area protection extends beyond buildings, to include streets, trees, paths and views**. As conservation areas are normally designated by the local planning authority, surely Kirklees Planning should look to ways to preserve the heritage of Yew Tree Farm in the centre of Farnley Tyas, otherwise what is the point of it having been designated a conservation area?

Since it is desirable to preserve and enhance the character and appearance of a Conservation area, then these plans for Yew Tree Farm should be rejected and new plans submitted, which must be sympathetic to the listed buildings and give consideration to retaining the special character of the village.

It is imperative that the Planning Committee visit the site. If they are not familiar with this picturesque and historical village, mentioned in 1086 in the Domesday Book, then viewing it as a drawing cannot possibly conjure up the reality of this area.

Bearing all this in mind, I would like to make the following specific points:

- The old nineteenth-century farmhouse should be retained and converted, rather than pulled down. It forms part of the farmstead and is significant because it must have been the original farmhouse on the site at one time. It is part of the conservation area, and making room for the access road is not adequate justification for the proposed demolition of this historical asset. This was the last working farm in the village. Previous developments at Beech Farm and Park Farm have sadly erased any reference to the farming heritage of the village. This should not be allowed to happen at Yew Tree Farm.
- New houses on plots 10-16 should not be allowed to overlook the existing houses on New Lane Terrace, 51 and 53 The Village and The Old Reading Rooms. The proposed design for these houses might look fine on a suburban housing estate, but it is totally unsuitable for a development alongside the 17th Century listed buildings on this site. The layout in straight lines is also inappropriate in a village where organic development has taken place over the centuries. Surely a more imaginative layout with

low-roofed buildings, (such as exist all over the village), would be more fitting? In this way the trees and Victorian farmhouse could also be saved. There is an opportunity here for an award-winning design which would enhance the village centre, not turn it into yet another characterless housing estate.

- The development of Manor Barn into four units is gross over-development. This listed barn is one of the most significant features in the village, and as such should be considered a visual amenity. It is visible from anywhere in the village centre, but particularly from the Golden Cock pub. Visitors to the pub on a sunny day will not want to sit outside and look over at what will amount to a car park and bin-housing area, which they intend to hide with fencing. Manor Barn should make two dwellings and could be designed to retain its attractive frontage.
- Planners should not allow any wooden fencing in this highly visual area. All boundary walls should be in local stone. Both Beech Farm and Park Farm developments have dry stone walls round all the properties. Yew Tree Farm is the least suitable of the three sites to make cheap economies, being the most prominent site in the village.
- I object strongly to the sycamore trees being felled. They are an important part of the landscape in this village, which is dotted throughout with these magnificent, ancient trees. I am also very concerned that any excavation work on plots 14-16 could damage the roots of the sycamores in the churchyard, which will extend a long way under the proposed building sites.
- I object to any incursion into Green Belt land (plots 10-13). England's Green Belt covers a mere 12.4% of the land in England. Developers should not be allowed to nibble away at it. This particular developer has already made incursions into Green Belt on the Park Farm estate. It should not be allowed to happen again on Yew Tree Farm.
- Some of the above points were made by the 29 people who responded to Peacock and Smith's invitation to comment on their plans in the early stages. It would appear that not one single change was made.
- As someone who walks their dog along this footpath twice a day, I ask that PROW Kir59/10 to the West and adjacent to the Church should remain unobstructed at all times and should not be used as site access

or parking. It is also required to be accessible at any time for funerals and wheelchair access. This must be made very clear to building contractors.

- The documents provided by the applicant do not address the issue of bats and their habitat. Bat boxes are shown on the plan, but how the developer arrived at the decision to install these particular boxes from the dozen or more specific designs available, needs to be explained. Was a proper survey done, and if so, where can we read the results of that survey? As this is the last farm in the village, when the barns go, where will the bats go? It is illegal to damage or destroy bat roosting places. As far as I am aware, no bat surveys were ever undertaken before the barns at Beech Farm, Sycamore Farm and then later Park Farm, were demolished. Bat habitats must surely have been destroyed, but again, as far as I am aware, no bat boxes were ever installed on the the Beech Farm and Park Farm developments.
- I would like any development which is eventually given permission by KMC to be very carefully monitored by Planning Enforcement officers. The same developer who is making this application failed to observe the ruling on Park Farm that the listed building had to be "substantially complete" before anyone was allowed to move into any of the new properties there. This did not happen. Similarly with the Beech Farm development, this developer is supposed to be responsible for maintenance of Field Lane until such a time as the development is finished. For nearly eight years now, residents on Field Lane have to regularly ask, remind, cajole, plead with him regularly to fulfil his obligations.

To conclude, I would ask once again that this application go before the Planning Committee. I hope that they will reject these plans as they stand, and recommend a new, more sympathetic housing design and layout.

Yours sincerely,

